This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

K 48

יהוה

INSTITVTIO THEOLOGICA
ANDOVER. EVNBATA. MDCCCVII.
Ps. CXIX. 160.
כדברך חבינני
JOH. XVII. 17.
ὁ λογος σου αληθεια εστιν
ΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ.

K 48

יהוה

INSTITVTIO THEOLOGICA
ANDOVER. FVNDATA MDCCCVII.
Ps. CXIX. 160.
כדברך הביננו
JOH. XVII. 17.
ὁ λογος σος ἀληθεια ἐστι·
ΑΚΡΟΓΩΝΙ
ΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ.

THE

MANUAL OF PEACE;

EXHIBITING

THE EVILS AND REMEDIES OF WAR.

BY

THOMAS C. UPHAM,

PROFESSOR OF MENTAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY IN BOWDOIN COLLEGE.

STEREOTYPE EDITION.

BOSTON:

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

1842.

PREFACE.

It is with unfeigned diffidence I present this work to the public. I am not ignorant of the defects in its execution; and I commend it to the reader solely on account of the greatness of the object. That wars must cease, absolutely and universally, is certain; but they will cease in connection with *effort*. And I felt desirous to unite my labors, however feeble they might be thought to be, with that small band of philanthropists, who have already taken the field on this subject. It is already evident that their labors have not been in vain; and the hope, based upon the most rational foundation, begins to be cherished, that wars will soon terminate. How desirable it is that every Christian, that every friend of his race, should contribute his efforts in the furtherance of this great object!

In preparing this work, I have freely availed myself of the labors of others, and take this opportunity to acknowledge my obligations in particular to Dr. Noah Worcester, Dymond, Mr. Grimké, Edward Livingston, Thomas Hancock, and Mr. Ladd. To the gentleman last named, whose labors in the cause of peace are too well known to require any mention here, I am indebted for having my attention first called to this important subject.

Thomas C. Upham.

Bowdoin College, *Nov.* 1835.

NOTE TO THE STEREOTYPE EDITION.

THE original work embraced, "1. *The Evils and Remedies of War*; 2. *Suggestions on the Law of Nations*; 3. *Considerations of a Congress of Nations.*" The two last parts, and several chapters in the first, on capital punishments, are, with the author's consent, omitted in this edition, (though evincing, in our judgment, even more research and ability than what is here published,) for the purpose of bringing before a much larger number of readers the portions most important to the cause of Peace.

G. C. B.

BOSTON, 1842.

CONTENTS.

Page.

INTRODUCTION, ... 7

CHAP. I. — Sufferings of the Field of Battle, ... 16

CHAP. II. — Influence of War on Domestic Life, ... 35

CHAP. III. — Influence of War on the Morals of Soldiers, 45

CHAP. IV. — Influence of War on National Prosperity,.. 55

CHAP. V. — Influence of War on the Progress of Civilization,..... 65

CHAP. VI. — Influence of War upon Missions,..... 77

CHAP. VII. — Causes of War, ... 83

CHAP. VIII. — Of War as examined by the Light of Nature,..... 88

CHAP. IX. — Of War as examined by the Old Testament, 95

CHAP. X. — Of War as examined by the Principles of the Gospel,..... 105

CHAP. XI. — Objections drawn from the New Testament,..... 122

CHAP. XII. — Testimony and Practice of the Primitive Christians, ... 134

CHAP. XIII. — Of War in Connection with the Millennium,..... 149

CHAP. XIV. — Popular Objections, ... 154

CHAP. XV. — On exercising the Office of Chaplain, ... 167

CHAP. XVI. — Of War in Connection with Education,.. 172

CHAP. XVII. — National Glory as connected with War, 181

CHAP. XVIII. — Of the Duty of Private Christians and Ministers,..... 188

CHAP. XIX. — Of Non-Intercourse in Connection with Peace, ... 193

CHAP. XX. — Practical Efficacy of the Principles of Peace,..... 199

INTRODUCTION.

PEACE is as old as Christianity; but specific efforts in this cause are of recent origin. Erasmus, the father of modern literature, and the pioneer of the Reformation, wrote in its behalf with an eloquence far beyond his age; but it was not till the downfall of Napoleon, and the consequent pacification of Europe, that any effective movement was made on the subject. Near the close of 1814, NOAH WORCESTER, the patriarch of this cause in modern times, published his *Solemn Review of the Custom of War;* and the first Peace Society was organized, the next summer, in the city of New York, and followed, in less than ten months, by one in Massachusetts, another in Ohio, and another in London, — the present London Peace Society, — all without any knowledge of each other's existence. The AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, as a bond of union among the friends of peace through the United States, was established in 1828; and kindred efforts have been made, not only in England, but in France, in Switzerland, and other parts of Christendom.

We wish the cause of Peace to be distinctly understood. It seeks only the abolition of a specific, well-defined custom, — the practice of international war, — and has nothing to do with any thing else. All the relations among men consist either in the relation of individuals to one another, in the relation of individuals to society or government, or the relation of one society or government to another; and the cause of

Peace is restricted to this last class of relations, and aims solely at *such an application of the* GOSPEL *to the intercourse of nations, as shall put an end to the practice of settling their disputes by the sword.*

This view of our cause relieves it from a variety of extraneous questions. If our only province is the intercourse of nations, and our sole object the abolition of war between them, then have we nothing to do with capital punishments, or the strict inviolability of human life, or the question whether the gospel allows the application of physical force to the government of states, schools, and families. We go merely against war; and war is defined by our best lexicographers to be "a contest by force between nations." It is not only a conflict unto death, but such a conflict between governments alone; and neither a parent chastising his child, nor a teacher punishing his pupil, nor a father defending his family against the midnight assassin, nor a ruler inflicting the penalties of law upon a criminal, can properly be called war, because the parties are not nations alone, but either individuals, or individuals and government. The cause of Peace is not encumbered with such cases, but confines itself to the single purpose of abolishing war.

Now, is there no possibility of accomplishing this object? Not a few persons of intelligent benevolence, while acknowledging and deploring the evils of war, seem to doubt whether it is possible to abolish a custom so deeply rooted in the passions of mankind, imbedded every where in the habits of society, and wrought into the texture of every government on earth.

This skepticism is one of the delusions of war, and springs from a fundamental misconception of the subject. It proceeds on the assumption, that war is a natural, necessary evil, as inevitable as a tempest or an earthquake; an evil as directly from God, or the

laws he has established, as the ravages of a plague, or the eruptions of a volcano; an evil which no agency of men can either inflict or avert! War without minds to will it, or hands to wage it! We cannot well conceive a grosser mistake, or a plainer contradiction in terms. War is a conflict between men; and, if they are not mere machines, it must be their voluntary act. It is just as subject as duelling, the slave trade, or any other custom, to the will of men; it exists solely because they choose it; its continuance depends entirely on their choice; and whenever we can so far change that choice as to make them resolve on discarding the war-policy, it must of necessity come to an end at once and forever.

Is such a change impossible? No more than a multitude of similar changes that have already been wrought in the sentiments, habits, and customs of mankind. There is nothing in their war-passions, nothing in the structure of society or government, nothing in the nature, the long continuance, or deep inveteracy of this custom, nothing in all the influences that have been for ages accumulating over the whole earth for its support, to forbid the hope of its entire, perpetual abolition.

Look at the power of the gospel. It is God's sovereign remedy for all the moral maladies of our world; and, when rightly applied, it will, with his blessing, triumph sooner or later over the mightiest and most inveterate forms of error, sin, and misery. So it has done; so it will yet do. Without sword or spear, with no diadem or purple, with no purse or scrip, it started from the cross upon the godlike enterprise of reforming a world; and paganism, with its legion of errors and sins, vanished before it. Trace its progress, and you will find it abolishing slavery and gladiatorial shows in the Roman empire, and subsequently putting an end to feudal and private wars, to knight-errantry, and witchcraft, and judicial combats,

and trial by ordeal, and a multitude of kindred practices. Has the gospel, then, no power to abolish war? This very custom it has stripped of its most revolting features, and accomplished already more than half the work of its utter extinction; and is there no possibility of its completing what it has so auspiciously begun?

We see what the gospel *can* do for all men, in what it *has* done for some that have long discarded every species of war as unchristian. It is well known that Quakers, Moravians, and a few other sects, will take no part in any war, offensive or defensive; and just as far as such sentiments and habits prevail, war becomes, of course, impossible. True, such men might, if the God of peace would permit it, be butchered in cold blood; but there could be no war, no *mutual* butchery. Yet these sects are men of like passions with ourselves; and, if they have been trained to such habits, all men could be. We are not now inquiring whether their views are correct; we merely infer from their example the possibility of educating the whole human race to an utter, everlasting abandonment of war.

But we may hope for the abolition of this custom without the general prevalence of such extreme views. Already do we see Christendom verging to such a result. Its general peace has now (1842) been preserved for more than a quarter of a century; we find its leading cabinets disposed to settle their disputes by better means than the sword; and these substitutes bid fair to supersede the whole war-system, and introduce in its place a general and permanent policy of peace.

To such a result a vast variety of causes are now conspiring. It would require a volume to exhibit them in full detail; but it may, perhaps, suffice to know, that the best influences of the age, all the means of general improvement, are so many auxilia-

ries in the work of a world's pacification. The gradual, yet very perceptible change of public opinion on the subject; — the growing influence of the people, always the chief sufferers from war, on all the governments of the civilized world; — the sway which moral influence is every where gaining in the intercourse of individuals and nations; — the power of the press, the pulpit, and the school, each the natural ally of peace; — the progress of liberty and political reform, requiring peace for their ultimate success; — the spirit of free inquiry, and the diffusion of intelligence, on all subjects; — the disposition to scrutinize with severity old usages, institutions, and opinions; — the countless improvements which philanthropy is every where making in the character and condition of mankind; — the diminished respect now felt for men of blood, and the increasing reluctance to regard the wholesale butchers of mankind as proper objects of gratitude or admiration; — the pacific tendencies of literature, science, and all the arts that minister to individual happiness, or national prosperity; — the wide extension of commerce, and the consequent interlinking, over the globe, of interests which war must destroy or endanger; — the transfer of international competition from the field of battle to those departments of peaceful industry and skill by which wealth, comfort, and refinement are procured; — the more frequent, more extended intercourse of Christians and learned men in different parts of the earth; — the new and effective instrumentalities now employed to bring the mass of minds through Christendom, especially the young, under the benign influences of the Bible, the great manual of peace; — the progress of kindred reforms, accumulating materials, and preparing the way for this; — the rapid spread of the gospel in pagan lands, the fuller development of its spirit in Christendom, and the more direct, more successful application of its principles to various forms

of sin and misery; — the great increase of light on the subject of war, and the obvious necessity of peace for the unembarrassed prosecution of those enterprises which are now tasking the energies of patriots, philanthropists, and Christians; — all these, and many other causes, are fast conspiring to draw all civilized nations into a settled, permanent policy of peace.

The steady, omnipresent operation of such causes, war cannot withstand forever. The world is becoming too wise and too good to tolerate much longer a custom so foolish and so wicked. It is a libel on the age, a withering sarcasm upon its civilization and Christianity. Its doom is sealed; it must perish sooner or later; and we have only to inquire how soon, by what means, and in what way, this foul and terrible scourge can be brought to an end.

War is driven to its last intrenchment. No decent man now attempts to justify it, except as a dire necessity; but even this stale plea cannot suffice long, for there is, in truth, no more need of it than there is of the slave trade, or any other abomination. Nations could, if they would, adjust all their difficulties without war, as well as individuals among us can theirs without duels. The only necessity there is for it, comes from the wrong choice of men; and, if every Christian community were trained to regard it as we do the kindred practice of duelling, it would soon be put under the ban of the civilized world, and its place supplied by substitutes far better than the sword, for all purposes of protection and redress.

We cannot now expatiate on these substitutes. There is negotiation, or amicable agreement between the parties without foreign aid; the best of all methods, so long as the parties keep cool enough to use it aright, and sufficient, in a correct state of public opinion, to obviate nearly every danger of war. There is arbitration, or voluntary reference to a third party; an expedient adopted when the parties are unable to ad-

just their own difficulties, or prefer the decision of an umpire mutually chosen. There is also mediation; a resort when governments in anger withdraw from official intercourse, and a third power, friendly to both, interposes with the offer of its services as mediator; a new expedient, hitherto successful in almost every case, and full of promise for the future peace of Christendom. Here are substitutes enough to obviate all necessity for war; and, if rightly used, they will eventually supersede the whole custom.

But the substance of these principles we would imbody in a permanent system, that shall be to nations what our codes and courts of law are to individuals. We wish nations to unite, as individuals have, in settling, by a well-defined code of international law, their reciprocal rights and obligations; and then in establishing a common tribunal, like a bench of judges, or a board of arbiters, to interpret that law, and adjust all difficulties among the brotherhood of nations.

Here is a synopsis of the plan; and for its execution, there must be, first, a congress or convention of nations, to settle, as far as possible, the principles of international law; and, next, a court of nations, separate from the former, and created by it, but composed of members selected by the governments associated, to apply that law, and adjudicate whatever cases might be referred to them. The convention would correspond to our legislature, but with this difference, that it would have power, like plenipotentiaries in negotiating a treaty, only to recommend the principles of international law, to be ratified or rejected by their respective governments. The code thus formed would be a collection of treaties, and have the binding force of compact and agreement between the parties. The court would resemble our judiciary, except that no party would be obliged, without their own choice, to appeal to its authority, or to abide by its decisions. It would have no fleets or armies to enforce its de-

crees, but would rely for this purpose solely on public opinion, or the good sense of the parties, and the influence of its own reputation for integrity and wisdom.

We cannot now dwell on the details of this scheme, nor attempt the slightest argument in its favor. Its object and its fundamental principles commend themselves to every candid, reflecting mind; and, if the subject were brought fully before all Christendom, there would doubtless be found a strong desire among the mass of the people to have the experiment tried with as little delay as possible.

Such a reform, however, will not come of itself, nor be the work of a day. Means must be used; and these will require, for a series of years, the union of multitudes in all parts of Christendom. Rulers alone can do the thing; but only those in popular governments can be expected to take hold of such a project in earnest. Nor will such rulers move except at the call of the people; and the people, before they will demand it in tones not to be disregarded, must be more enlightened on the subject. There must be, for this purpose, combined, vigorous, persevering efforts. The great engines of influence upon the popular mind must be set and kept at work. The pulpit must speak; the press must speak; instructors in our seminaries of learning, from the highest to the lowest, must speak; teachers in Sabbath schools, and pious parents around their firesides, must speak; every church, every Christian, every friend of God or man, high and low, old and young, male and female, must all coöperate to recast public opinion in the mould of peace, to fill the mass of minds through Christendom with deep, undying abhorrence of war, and rouse them to demand with one voice some substitute that shall ere long supersede its atrocities and horrors forever.

To this object the following pages are a noble and eloquent contribution from one of the first writers of the age. Parts of the original work, not essential to

the cause of peace, have been omitted, with the author's consent, in the hope of bringing it within the reach of a larger number of readers; but enough still remains to furnish, in a small compass, probably the best general view of the subject that can be found in the English or any other language.

G. C. B.

Boston, 1842.

CHAPTER FIRST.

SUFFERINGS OF THE FIELD OF BATTLE.

We commence with an examination of some of the evils of war. In respect to this almost inexhaustible topic, we wish to premise to the reader, that we shall attempt to give only a mere glimpse of it. So numerous are the other topics on which we shall find it proper and important to touch in the course of this work, it will not be in our power, for this reason among others, to delay upon any single one at much length. Indeed, if it were otherwise, if we had time enough, and space enough, we should probably find, on making the experiment, that a full and perfect exhibition of the evils of war is, from their very intensity and the greatness of their number, wholly beyond our power. And yet we cannot but hope that the statements which will be made, although necessarily brief, will leave such impressions upon the mind of the reader, as will be favorable to the great object we have in view, — the promotion of universal peace.

In the first place, let us consider, for a moment, the objects which are presented to our notice on the field of battle; let us place ourselves on some conspicuous spot, in the neighborhood of the place of contest, where we may not only distinctly see what is going on, but may be at liberty to indulge those reflections which such a scene and situation are calculated to inspire. The first thing that arrests our attention is the sudden discovery of large masses of men rapidly assembling together; and, as we perceive that they bear the same image, and know that they

come from the hand of the same Creator, we naturally conclude, on every principle of reason and humanity, that they are assembling for no other than just and amicable purposes. But we soon discover, to our great surprise, that their meeting and salutations, so far from being of a consultative and friendly character, are violent and threatening, and take place with every demonstration of hostility, amid the clash of swords and the bristling of bayonets. But man, even when placed in this lamentable position of crime and cruelty, discovers traits of character which show that he was formed for better things, — great sagacity, promptness in the moment of peril, activity, courage, indomitable perseverance. These traits of character might be applied for great good; but here they are applied, and too dreadfully applied, in accelerating the work of destruction, — to smite down the opposing combatant, to tear open the fountains of life, to roll onward the dreadful wave of war. In a few moments after these vast masses are met together, we hear the clash of swords, the roar of cannon, the noise and the confusion, the shout of victory, the groans of the wounded and the dying; but nothing, except some shadowy outlines, is seen. After a while, the smoke rolls slowly away, and, in the light of the glaring and sickly sun, we behold the whole plain covered with human bodies, multitudes of them dead, and others in a state of intense suffering from their wounds; and, if we undertake to count them, the enumeration only increases that overwhelming sensation which the mere glance had tended to inspire: — on the field of Austerlitz, twenty thousand; on the field of Bautzen, twenty-five thousand; at Dresden, thirty thousand; at Waterloo, forty thousand; at Eylau, fifty thousand; at Borodino, eighty thousand.

We do not go back to the dreadful scenes of antiquity; to the days of the Alexanders, and the Han-

nibals, and the Cæsars; to the battle-fields of Cannæ and Philippi. But look merely at what has taken place in our own days, and, as it were, under our own eyes, and, what renders it still more surprising, amid the light of civilization, and under the blaze of the gospel. As we cast our eyes over the field of battle, covered with such a multitude of dead and wounded persons, we cannot but be filled with astonishment and horror, especially when we remember that the combatants are all the dependent and favored children of that great Being who not only made them, but required them to love one another. Certain it is, that the spectator, as he looks upon the field of battle, has emotions of unmingled surprise and consternation; he feels that a dreadful crime has been committed, the guilt of which rests somewhere; he is stunned and amazed, and hardly knows what character to attach to man, who can permit himself to be engaged in such transactions; and yet it cannot be doubted that the effect of the scene which is before him is lessened by its own dimensions — is diminished by its very vastness. The man who is thinking of the sufferings of forty or fifty thousands can have no very distinct conceptions of the sufferings of a particular individual in that vast number. If he could take a full and distinct view of the sufferings of each one in that great multitude, — if he could see the tears and the agonies in each particular case, and, by some process of intellectual and sentient arithmetic, could bring them all into one sum, and place them all before the mind at once, — what a vast amount! what unparalleled wretchedness! with what torture would it fill the soul! But this cannot be: the structure of the human mind is such as not to admit of it. And it is for this reason that we will turn away a moment from the contemplation of the scene in its totality, in its mere general features, for the purpose of seeing it in its parts, its fragments, its particular instances.

There was a certain Captain Cooke, in the British army at the battle of New Orleans, who has recently given to the public some interesting incidents, which took place under his own eye in that memorable engagement. And it is *incidents*, the facts in which individuals are concerned, the insulated details of a battle, and not the whole, assimilated and contemplated in one broad mass, which are to give us the precisely true conception of the miseries usually endured on such occasions. On the morning of the eighth of January, the officer above referred to saw three companies of soldiers, about two hundred and forty in number, advancing on the high road to New Orleans, for the purpose of attacking what was called the Crescent Battery. Among other persons, he saw Lieutenant Duncan Campbell, with whom he seems to have been particularly acquainted, and asked him where he was going. The lieutenant replied that he did not know. "Then," said Captain Cooke, "you have got into what I call a good thing: the far-famed American battery is in front, at a short range; and, on the left, this spot is flanked, at eight hundred yards, by their batteries on the opposite side of the river." At this piece of information, the lieutenant laughed heartily. Captain Cooke advised him to take off his blue pelisse coat, in order to be like the rest of the men; but he promptly refused, — uttering, at the same time, some expressions of defiance against the Americans, — and, having embraced the captain, went onward. He was a young officer, of twenty years of age, of a fine personal appearance, and had fought in many bloody encounters in France and Spain. But what was the fate which war had reserved for one so young, so interesting in appearance, and towards whom, undoubtedly, the affections of many friends in a distant land were fondly directed? "Near the close of the battle, Lieutenant Duncan Campbell," says the writer, "was seen, to our

left, running about in circles, first staggering one way, then another, and at length he fell on the sod, helplessly, upon his face, and again tumbled; and when he was picked up, he was found to be blind, from the effects of grape shot, that had torn open his forehead, given him a slight wound in the leg, and had also ripped the scabbard from his side, and knocked the cap from his head. While being borne insensible to the rear, he still clinched the hilt of his sword with a convulsive grasp, the blade thereof being broken off, close at the hilt, with grape shot; and, in a state of delirium and suffering, he lived for a few days." Here is an incident which may be called a common one: he died much as any other soldier on the field of battle may be supposed to die. But this is the cause of the difference in our feelings: we single him out from the rest of the multitude; we do not mingle, and confound, and lose sight of his suffering in the vague and indefinite idea of suffering in the mass; and while we are too often unmoved, in consequence of our inability to combine a particular and a general view, by the general statement of thousands having suffered, we at once exclaim, when our eye is fixed on a single case, like the one before us, "What a shocking death is this! What barbarity there is in war! What insanity in men, that they should butcher and tear to pieces one another!"

"For five hours," continues the narrative of this officer, "the enemy plied us with grape and round shot. Some of the wounded, lying in the mud, or on the wet grass, managed to crawl away; but, every now and then, some unfortunate man was lifted off the ground by round shot, and lay killed or mangled. During the tedious hours we remained in front, it was necessary to lie on the ground, to cover ourselves from the projectiles. An officer of our regiment was in a reclining posture, when grape shot passed through both his knees: at first he sunk back faint-

ly; but, at length, opening his eyes, and looking at his wounds, he said, 'Carry me away; I am *chilled to death.*' And, as he was hoisted on men's shoulders, more round and grape shot passed his head. Taking off his cap, he waved it; and, after many narrow escapes, got out of range, suffered amputation of both legs; but died of his wounds on board ship, after enduring all the pain of the surgical operation, and passing down the lake in an open boat."

There was an individual present at the naval battle of Trafalgar, who relates some things that came under his personal notice. From the account, abridged and prepared for the second volume of the Harbinger of Peace, we make the following extract: — "Now that the conflict was over, our kindred feelings resumed their sway. Eager inquiries were expressed, and earnest congratulations exchanged at this moment. The officers came to make their report to the captain; and the fatal result cast a gloom over the scene of our triumph. I have alluded to the impressions of our first lieutenant, that he should not survive the contest. This gallant officer was severely wounded in the thigh, and underwent amputation; but his prediction was realized, for he expired before the action had ceased. The junior lieutenant was also mortally wounded, on the quarter-deck. These gallant fellows were lying beside each other, in the gun-room, preparatory to their being committed to the deep; and here many met to take a last look of our departed friends, whose remains soon floated in the promiscuous multitude, without distinction either of rank or nation. In the act of launching a poor sailor over the poop, he was discovered to breathe; and, after being a week in the hospital, the ball, which entered the temple, came out of his mouth. I notice this occurrence, to show the probability that many are thrown overboard when life is not extinct. The upper deck presented a confused and dreadful

appearance: masts, yards, sails, ropes, and fragments of wreck, were scattered in every direction; nothing could be more horrible than the scene of blood and mangled remains with which every part was covered, and which, from the quantity of splinters, resembled a shipwright's yard strewed with gore.

"From our extensive loss, — thirty-four killed, and ninety-six wounded, — our cockpit exhibited a scene of suffering and carnage which rarely occurs. I visited this abode of suffering, with the natural impulse which led many others thither, namely, to ascertain the fate of a friend or companion. So many bodies in such a confined place, and under such distressing circumstances, would affect the most obdurate heart. My nerves were but little accustomed to such trials; but even the dangers of the battle did not seem more terrific than the spectacle before me. On a long table lay several, anxiously looking for their turn to receive the surgeon's care, yet dreading the fate which he might pronounce. One subject was undergoing amputation; and every part was heaped with sufferers. Their piercing shrieks and expiring groans were echoed through this vault of misery; and, even at this distant period, the heart-sickening picture is alive in my memory."

History, as it is generally written, is nothing but an outline, a skeleton, a mere *anatomy;* and it gives us scarcely a more perfect idea of the events it undertakes to describe, than the human skeleton does of the symmetry and beauty of the human form. If we wish to go beneath the surface, if we wish to know things as they are, we must look into what are sometimes called the *documents* of history — private letters, biographical notices, personal memoirs, and incidents, which aspire to no higher honor than that of being chronicled in a newspaper. A person may read Voltaire's History of Louis XIV., and yet have but a very feeble conception of the miseries of war;

but not so when he reads the Memoirs of Madame de la Rochejaquelein. The one deals in outlines, — it leaves merely a general, and therefore a feeble impression; the other, limited to a single event, gives its minute facts, and we see it distinctly and graphically just as it was, — and, what is more, we *feel* it. We could give passages from this little book; but if we made a beginning, we should not know where to end; and we merely mark it down as a document to be referred to, in all times to come, in proof of the inexpressible miseries which men are bringing upon themselves by resorting to arms.

Of the books with which we are acquainted, one of the best calculated to give an impression of the immediate evils of war, distinct and vivid, — an impression corresponding in some degree to the reality, — is Labaume's Narrative of the Campaign in Russia. There were two hundred and sixty thousand soldiers present at the battle of Borodino, nearly all of whom were engaged in it. In the two armies, there were two hundred pieces of cannon, and, according to some accounts, a much greater number, constantly employed; and forty thousand dragoons, crossing the field in every direction, rode over the bodies of the lifeless and the wounded, and dyed the hoofs of their horses in human blood. The battle commenced on the seventh of September, at six o'clock in the morning, and continued till night. The loss in both armies has been estimated at eighty thousand. Labaume gives an account of what fell under his notice the day after the battle: "In traversing the elevated plain, on which we had fought, we were enabled to form an estimate of the immense loss that had been sustained by the Russians. A surface of about nine square miles in extent was covered with the killed and wounded, with the wreck of arms, lances, helmets, and cuirasses, and with balls as numerous as hailstones after a violent storm. In

many places, the bursting of shells had overturned men and horses; and such was the havoc occasioned by repeated discharges, that mountains of dead bodies were raised. But the most dreadful spectacle was the interior of the ravines, where the wounded had instinctively crawled to avoid the shot: here these unfortunate wretches, lying one upon another, destitute of assistance, and weltering in their blood, uttered the most horrid groans; loudly invoking death, they besought us to put an end to their excruciating torments. As our medical means of relief were insufficient, our fruitless compassion could only lament the calamities inseparable from a war so atrocious."

On his return with the retreating army from Moscow, this writer gives us another glimpse of the same field of battle. "My consternation was at its height on finding, near Borodino, the twenty thousand men, who had been slaughtered there, lying where they fell. The half-buried carcasses of men and horses covered the plain, intermingled with garments stained with blood, and bones gnawed by the dogs and birds of prey, and with the fragments of arms, drums, helmets, and cuirasses."

"As we were marching over the field of battle, we heard at a distance a pitiable object, who demanded our assistance. Touched by his plaintive cries, many of the soldiers drew near the spot, when, to their great astonishment, they observed a French soldier stretched on the ground, with both his legs broken. 'I was wounded,' said he, 'on the day of the great battle, and, finding myself in a lonely place, where I could gain no assistance, I dragged myself to the brink of a rivulet, and have lived near two months on grass and roots, and on some pieces of bread which I found amongst the dead bodies. At night, I have lain in the carcasses of dead horses, and with the flesh of these animals have dressed my wounds as well as with the best medicines. Having observed

you at a distance, I collected all my strength, and have advanced sufficiently near to make myself heard.' Whilst we expressed our surprise at the event, a general, who was made acquainted with a case as singular as it was affecting, ordered him to be placed in his own carriage." *

It is from such circumstantial details as we find in this account, that we become acquainted with the miseries actually endured by the French in their retreat from Moscow. "Overwhelmed," says this writer in another place, "by the whirlwinds of snow which assailed him, the soldier could no longer distinguish the main road from the ditches, and often fell into the latter, which served him for a tomb. Others, eager to press forward, dragged themselves along with pain; badly clothed and shod, having nothing to eat or drink, groaning, and shivering with cold, they gave no assistance, neither showed any signs of compassion to those who, sinking from weakness, expired around them."

"Many of these miserable creatures, dying from exhaustion, struggled hard in the agonies of death. Some of them, in the most affecting manner, bade adieu to their brethren and companions in arms; others, with their last sigh, pronounced the name of their mother, and of the country which gave them birth. The rigor of the cold benumbed their stiffened limbs, and soon reached their vitals. Stretched on the road, we could only see the heaps of snow that covered them, and that formed undulations in our route like those in a graveyard. Flocks of ravens, abandoning the plains to take shelter in the neighboring woods, croaked ominously as they flew over our

* It appears from Count Segur's History of the Expedition into Russia, chap. xiii., that the dead of the Russians had either been buried or carried off. The same writer estimates the number of Frenchmen, who were found unburied on the field of Borodino, at thirty thousand.

heads; and troops of dogs, which had followed us from Moscow, and lived solely on our bloody remains, howled around us, as if desirous of hastening the moment when we were to become their prey."

At the retreat of the French from Liadoui, in Lithuania, the town, as seems to have been the common practice in this savage war, was set on fire. "Amongst the burning houses were three large barns filled with poor soldiers, chiefly wounded. They could not escape from two of these without passing through the one in front, which was on fire. The most active saved themselves by leaping out of the windows; but all those who were sick or crippled, not having strength to move, saw the flames advancing rapidly to devour them. Touched by their shrieks, some, who were least hardened, endeavored in vain to save them: we could only see them half-buried under the burning rafters; through whirlwinds of smoke, they entreated their comrades to shorten their sufferings by depriving them of life, and, from motives of humanity, we thought it our duty to comply with their wishes. As there were some who, notwithstanding, still survived, we heard them, with feeble voices, crying, '*Fire on us! fire on us! at the head! at the head! do not miss!*' These heart-rending cries did not cease till the whole were consumed."

Before the French had completed the passage of the River Berezina, the Russians made a furious attack upon their rear-guard. "In the heat of the engagement, many balls fell on the miserable crowd that for three days had been pressing round the bridge, and even some shells burst in the midst of them. Terror and despair then took possession of every heart anxious for self-preservation; women and children, who had escaped so many disasters, seemed to have been preserved to experience a death still more deplorable. Leaving their carriages, they

ran to embrace the knees of the first person they met, and implored him with tears to take them to the other side. The sick and wounded, seated on the trunk of a tree, or supported on crutches, looked eagerly for some friend that could assist them; but their cries were lost in the air; every one thought only of his own safety.

"On seeing the enemy, those who had not crossed, mingling with the Poles, rushed towards the bridge; artillery, baggage, cavalry, and infantry, all endeavored to pass first. The strong threw into the water the weak who impeded their advance, and trampled under foot the sick and wounded whom they found in their way. Many hundreds were crushed under the wheels of the artillery; others, who had hoped to save themselves by swimming, were frozen in the river, or perished by slipping from the ice. Thousands and thousands of hopeless victims, notwithstanding these sorrowful examples, threw themselves into the Berezina, where they nearly all perished in convulsions of grief and despair.

"The division of Girard succeeded by force of arms in overcoming all the obstacles that retarded their march, and, scaling the mountain of dead bodies that obstructed the road, gained the opposite shore, where the Russians would soon have followed them if they had not immediately set fire to the bridge.

"Many of those who were left on the other bank, with the prospect of the most horrible death, attempted to cross the bridge through the flames; but midway they threw themselves into the river to avoid being burnt. At length, the Russians having made themselves masters of the field of battle, our troops retired; the passage of the river ceased, and the most tremendous uproar was succeeded by a death-like silence."

Let those who have been accustomed to merge the sufferings of individuals in those vague and in-

definite views which we take of suffering when contemplated in the mass, notice the following passage: "The road was covered with soldiers, who no longer retained the human form, and whom the enemy disdained to take prisoners. Every day furnished scenes too painful to relate. Some had lost their hearing, others their speech, and many, by excessive cold and hunger, were reduced to such a state of stupid frenzy, that they roasted the dead bodies for food, and even gnawed their own hands and arms. Some, who were too weak to lift a piece of wood, or to roll a stone towards the fire, sat down upon their dead companions, and, with an unmoved countenance, gazed upon the burning logs. When they were consumed, these livid spectres, unable to get up, fell by those on whom they had been seated. Many, in a state of mental alienation, in order to warm themselves, plunged their bare feet into the fire; some, with a convulsive laugh, threw themselves into the flames, and, uttering shocking cries, perished in the most horrible contortions; others, in a state of equal madness, followed their example, and shared the same fate!"

But some will say, perhaps, that these battles and this retreat were extraordinary, out of the common course, something unheard of before; and that they give an exaggerated and erroneous idea of the miseries attendant upon war; but, so far as we are able to learn, this suggestion does not appear to be sustained by the facts of history. From the earliest periods of the human race, there have been wars, and series of wars, continued for years, and almost for generations, that have been marked from beginning to end with inexpressible sufferings, and with the most dreadful atrocities, — such as the second Punic war; the war which terminated in the destruction of Jerusalem; the recent war of the Greek revolution; the wars, civil and foreign, of the French revolution;

the recent wars in Spanish South America; some of the wars between Russia and Turkey, and Russia and Poland; the early revolutionary wars of the Dutch republic; the wars of the invasion of Spain by Bonaparte; the so called thirty years' war, which involved almost all Europe, and was signalized by the death of Gustavus Adolphus. In the dreadful war last mentioned, the city of Magdeburg, in Prussia, was taken by assault by the imperial commander, count de Tilly; and here are some of the results:—

"Before noon, all the works were carried, and the town was in the hands of the enemy. Two gates were now opened by the besiegers for the entrance of the army, and Tilly marched part of his infantry into the town. He immediately occupied the principal streets, and, with pointed cannon, drove the citizens into their dwellings, there to await their destiny. They were not long held in suspense: a word from Tilly decided the fate of Magdeburg.

"Even a more humane general would have vainly attempted to restrain such soldiers; but Tilly never once made the attempt. The silence of their general left the soldiery masters of the lives of the citizens; and they broke without restraint into the houses to gratify every brutal appetite. The prayers of innocence excited some compassion in the hearts of the Germans, but none in the rude breasts of Pappenheim's Walloons. Scarcely had the massacre commenced, when the other gates were thrown open, and the cavalry, with the fearful hordes of the Croats, poured in upon the devoted town.

"And now began a scene of carnage which history has no language, poetry no pencil, to portray. Neither the innocence of childhood, nor the helplessness of old age, — neither youth, sex, rank, nor beauty, — could disarm the fury of the conquerors. Wives were dishonored in the arms of their husbands, daughters at the feet of their parents; and the de-

fenceless sex exposed to the double sacrifice of virtue and life. No condition, however obscure, or however sacred, could afford protection from the rapacity of the enemy. Fifty-three women were found beheaded in a single church. The Croats amused themselves with throwing children into the flames; Pappenheim's Walloons with stabbing infants at their mothers' breast. Some officers of the League, horror-struck at this dreadful scene, ventured to remind Tilly that he had it in his power to stop the carnage. 'Return in an hour,' was his answer, 'and I shall see what is to be done; the soldier must have some recompense for his danger and toils.' These horrors lasted without abatement, till at last the smoke and flames stopped the course of the plunderers. To increase the confusion, and break the resistance of the inhabitants, the imperialists had, in the commencement of the assault, fired the town in several places. A tempest now arose, which spread the flames with frightful rapidity through the town, till the blaze became universal. The confusion was deepened by the clouds of smoke, the heaps of dead bodies that strewed the ground, the clash of swords, the crash of falling ruins, and the streams of blood which ran along the streets. The atmosphere glowed, and the intolerable heat at last compelled even the murderers to take refuge in their camp. In less than twelve hours, this strong, populous, and flourishing city, one of the finest in Germany, was a heap of ashes, with the exception of two churches and a few houses. The administrator, Christian William, after receiving several wounds, was taken prisoner, with three of the burgomasters: most of the officers and magistrates had already met an enviable death. The avarice of the officers had saved four hundred of the richest citizens from death, in the hope of extorting from them an exorbitant ransom. This piece of humanity was owing principally to the officers of the League; and even this question-

able clemency, when contrasted with the blind and ruthless butchery of the Austrians, made them be regarded as guardian angels by the citizens.

"Scarcely had the flames abated, when the imperial soldiers returned to satiate anew their rage for plunder amidst the ruins and ashes of the town. Many were suffocated by the smoke; many found rich booty in the cellars, where the citizens had concealed their valuable effects. On the 13th of May, Tilly himself appeared in the town, after the streets had been cleared of ashes and corpses. Horrible and revolting to humanity was the scene that presented itself — the living crawling from under the dead, children wandering about with heart-rending cries, seeking their parents, and infants still sucking the dead bodies of their mothers. More than five thousand bodies were thrown into the Elbe, to clear the streets; a much greater number had been consumed by the flames. The entire amount of the slaughter was calculated at thirty thousand." *

It has been our object, in the extracts which have been made, not only to give a general idea of the miseries of war, but, in particular, to free the mind from that illusion, to which it is so liable to be subject, when it contemplates things in the mass, and is either too indolent or too little interested to look into their elements. Well does the author of Recollections of the Peninsula say, "When the history of any individual, who has fallen, is brought before us, we feel deeply, but wander over ground covered with corpses, about whom we know nothing, with comparative indifference; yet, if we knew the history attached to each lifeless body on which we gazed, with what tales of sorrow should we not become acquainted!"

In this very writer, who was himself an officer in the English army of the Peninsula, and who seems to

* Harbinger of Peace, Vol. I. p. 234.

have been sufficiently partial to a soldier's life, we have a number of affecting instances fully illustrative of this just remark. What recompense had the pomp and splendor of military life to that wretched captain of the 29th regiment, who, dreadfully lacerated by a ball, lay directly in the path of his comrades, and, with a heart-rending accent of grief, cried for water, or that they would kill him; but no one regarded his request? What consolation had the glitter of an epaulet and the sound of the spirit-stirring fife for that mangled and lifeless youth, not yet eighteen years of age, the darling child of a fond mother, who mourned in brokenness of heart on the banks of the murmuring and peaceful Loire? What balm was it in the power of earth to furnish to that miserable man, who, coming upon the field of Victoria, and inquiring for his two sons, the only remains of his beloved family, found them both dead? Who can measure the misery of that native of Arragon, who had himself been wounded in the field of battle, who had seen his mother dying of grief, his wife brutally dishonored and perishing in a hospital, his cottage burnt, and his father led out and shot in the market-place of his native village? * It is not enough, when we hear of twenty or thirty thousand slain on the field of battle, to heave a sentimental sigh, or to utter an unmeaning ejaculation of astonishment. Such an occasion is one, if we mistake not, which requires real astonishment, real sorrow, deep reflection, anxious inquiry, the exercise of the benevolent sympathies, and unfeigned humiliation before God.

It is impossible to repress the desire we feel that men generally, particularly those who profess to be guided by the principles of the gospel, should look this great subject fearlessly in the face, not only in

* See Recollections of the Peninsula, Am. ed, pp. 159, 162, 243, 247.

its outlines, but its details. With but few exceptions, it is certainly not too much to say that they have never done it as yet. Let it not for a moment be supposed that we can excuse ourselves in this important inquiry; that we can step aside, and leave it to others; that we have personally nothing to do, no responsibility to meet, no opinion to express, no warning to utter. The poet Cowper has somewhere said that he would not reckon in his list of friends the man who should needlessly set foot upon a worm; and it will not be denied that this language is expressive of a disposition which promptly commends itself to the just and benevolent feelings of our nature. Yes, it is beyond all question that, as men, as creatures of God, we are to be sparing even of the blood of a brute animal, of the life even of an insect. And what shall we say, then, when we steadily contemplate the scenes which have now been laid open before us; when we see, not mere worms and insects destroyed, but human beings; men, created in our own likeness, horribly mangled and torn to pieces; in some cases, thousands of acres of ground covered with piles of dead; women and children pierced through, and dashed down, and trodden into dust; the wounded left to perish on bleak snows, or burnt to death in their own hospitals; multitudes frozen with the cold and perishing with famine; every possible form and degree of agony and despair? Can we be deemed unreasonable in saying that this is a state of things which must be met, must be looked into? that it is high time for philosophers, for politicians, above all for professed Christians, to scrutinize it with the deepest solicitude? Shall the attention of the whole scientific and intellectual world be directed to the comparatively trifling circumstance of the discovery of a new plant, to the fall of a meteoric stone, or to some atmospheric phenomenon, — and shall war, that great moral phenomenon, so inexplicable as to

strike angels with astonishment, and to fill even the spirits of darkness with wonder, be deemed of so little consequence as to arrest no thought, excite no feeling, and secure no spirit of inquiry?

NOTE. — In the extracts from Labaume we have adopted Mr. Rees's Translation of Select Passages, contained in his Tract, entitled Sketches of the Horrors of War, in preference to extracting from the Translation, without the name of the author, in common circulation.

CHAPTER SECOND.

INFLUENCE OF WAR ON DOMESTIC LIFE.

In exhibiting the evils of war, more attention has generally been paid to the immediate horrors of the battle-field, than to the less marked and more remote evils which have been felt from this source in domestic life. So many attractions, addressed both to the sight and the imagination, throng around the memorable spot, where large armies meet and engage in battle, that, notwithstanding the inexpressible horrors of such a scene, men seldom turn away to contemplate the insulated objects of interest, scattered here and there in the distance. How many have dwelt with excited imaginations, and with a sincere feeling of deep commiseration, on the carnage of Austerlitz and Waterloo, to whom it has never occurred to turn to the distracted sister, mourning in her distant home over her fallen brother; or to the mother weeping in solitude over her beloved son; or to the wife, lamenting, with inexpressible grief, the untimely death of her husband! We propose, therefore, in the remarks which are to follow in this chapter, to indicate some of the unpropitious bearings of war on domestic life.

And in doing this, it is hardly necessary to remark that in domestic life we are to look for a large share of what yet remains of earthly quiet and happiness. The philanthropist and the Christian find much in the present state of things to perplex their faith, to create doubt, and to fill them with despondency; but, when they turn their eyes to the domestic circle, especially when it is blessed with the presence of the serious and

benign spirit of religion, they gladly acknowledge that there is one bright and illuminated spot in the surrounding darkness. But the horrors of war, dreadful and intense as they are on the field of battle, are experienced, with less display indeed, but with still greater intensity, in these distant abodes of peace and happiness. The soldier dies upon the field of battle; and however great may be the anguish he experiences, it is generally soon over; but the desolate hearts of his parents, and of his wife and children, are filled with sorrow, and hopelessness, and lamentation, for years. But these things are not made matters of history; in the emblazonment of the achievements of the battle-field they are entirely passed over and forgotten; it seems to be no part of the business either of the ephemeral gazette, or of the more serious and permanent page of history, to keep a record of tears shed in private, and of hearts that are bleeding and broken in retirement. But they ought never to be forgotten by the philanthropist, the Christian, the friend of the human species. That the piercing and overwhelming evils, which are now referred to, are not imaginary, every child and parent, every one who sustains the various domestic relations, has the testimony in himself, in the instinctive suggestions of his own bosom, whether he has actually experienced the evils in his own person or not. In the time of the American revolution, a young gentleman by the name of Asgill, a captain in the English service, though only nineteen years of age, was selected by lot, by the Americans, to whom he had fallen prisoner, to be put to death, in retaliation for some atrocities committed by the enemy. When the news reached England, his mother, Lady Asgill, with her whole family, was thrown into the deepest distress and sorrow. In her inexpressible affliction, she had recourse to the sovereigns of France, through the medium of the minister

count de Vergennes, although France was at that time at war with England. If any one wishes to know where the miseries of war are most truly and deeply felt, let him read the following extract from one of her letters to the French minister: — "My son, my only son, dear to me as he is brave, amiable as he is beloved, only nineteen years of age, a prisoner of war in consequence of the capitulation of Yorktown, is at present confined in America as an object of reprisal. Shall the innocent share the fate of the guilty? Figure to yourself, sir, the situation of a family in these circumstances. Surrounded as I am with objects of distress, bowed down by fear and grief, words are wanting to express what I feel, and to paint such a scene of misery; my husband, given over by the physicians some hours before the arrival of the news, not in a condition to be informed of it; my daughter, attacked by a fever, accompanied with delirium, speaking of her brother in tones of wildness, and without an interval of reason, unless it be to listen to some circumstances to console her heart. Let your sensibility, sir, paint to you my profound, my inexpressible misery, and plead in my favor; a word, a word from you, like a voice from Heaven, would liberate us from desolation, from the last degree of misfortune." *

Such are the deep pangs implanted in the heart of an accomplished lady by the occurrences of war. In consequence of her education and her distinguished situation in life, they have excited an interest in the public, and have become a portion of history. But there are multitudes of other mothers and other sisters, whose sorrows have been as deeply felt and as sincerely lamented, but whose griefs have never reached the public ear. Dark and withering as they were,

* Thatcher's Military Journal during the American Revolutionary War, p. 308.

they have been known only to their own bosoms, or to the small circle immediately around them; too secluded for general sympathy, though not unseen by that God who has made of one blood all the nations of the earth, and who commands us to love our neighbor as ourselves.

In recently looking over Godwin's History of the Commonwealth of England, we were struck with an incident, which seemed to us to be strikingly illustrative of the disastrous bearings of war on the hopes and happiness of domestic life. The marquis of Vaydes was a distinguished Spanish nobleman, who had resided twenty-three years in America, having been nine years governor of Chili, and fourteen years viceroy of Peru. Having accumulated an ample fortune, he was now returning to enjoy his riches and honors in his native land; animated, doubtless, with all those fond anticipations of happiness, which are so apt to inspire one who has been many years absent from the home of his ancestors and of his childhood. He had in the vessel with him his wife and seven children; the eldest, a daughter, contracted to the son of the duke of Medina Celi, and the youngest not more than a year old. It is not easy to conceive what delightful and transporting emotions swelled the bosoms of this prosperous and happy family, as they rapidly approached the shores of their beloved Spain, where all their hopes were centred, and all their blissful visions were soon to be realized. But they were sadly disappointed; an unhappy and unnecessary war was then in progress between Spain and England; and the vessel of the marquis was attacked and taken During the battle, which was severe, and in which this vessel alone lost a hundred and ten men, she took fire. The wife and eldest daughter of Vaydes fell into a swoon, and, together with one of the sons, perished in the flames. The unhappy father had an

opportunity to escape; but, overcome with feelings of despair at the horrid fate of his beloved wife and children, he voluntarily plunged into the flames, and died with them.* We leave this affecting incident (only one among a thousand others of a scarcely less marked and distressing nature, to be found in the annals of war) to the reflections of the serious and benevolent reader. Is it possible for any one to reflect upon this dreadful catastrophe, either in its relation to the parents and children who died in this unexpected and horrid manner, or in relation to the poor orphan children who survived, without feelings of the deepest compassion? Can the father and mother, as they behold around them their smiling offspring, dear to them as their own life, think of this dreadful scene without profound and overwhelming sensations of grief and horror?

We take the liberty to introduce another affecting incident, tending to illustrate our subject. Among the distinguished men who fell victims in the war of the American revolution, was Colonel Isaac Hayne, of South Carolina, a man who, by his amiability of character and high sentiments of honor and uprightness, had secured the good will and affection of all who knew him. He had a wife and six small children, the eldest a boy thirteen years of age. His wife, to whom he was tenderly attached, fell a victim of disease — an event hastened, not improbably, by the inconveniences and sufferings incident to a state of war, in which the whole family largely participated. Colonel Hayne himself was taken prisoner by the English forces, and in a short time was executed on the gallows, under circumstances calculated to excite the deepest commiseration. A great number of persons,

* Godwin's History of the English Commonwealth, Book IV. chap. 19.

both Englishmen and Americans, interceded for his life; the ladies of Charleston signed a petition in his behalf; his motherless children were presented on their bended knees as humble suitors for their beloved father; but all in vain. During the imprisonment of the father, his eldest son was permitted to stay with him in the prison. Beholding his only surviving parent, for whom he felt the deepest affection, loaded with irons and condemned to die, he was overwhelmed with consternation and sorrow. The wretched father endeavored to console him, by reminding him that the unavailing grief of his son tended only to increase his own misery; that we came into this world merely to prepare for a better; that he was himself prepared to die, and could even rejoice that his troubles were so near an end. "To-morrow," said he, "I set out for immortality; you will accompany me to the place of my execution; and, when I am dead, take my body and bury it by the side of your mother." The youth here fell on his father's neck, crying, "O my father, my father, I will die with you! I will die with you!" Colonel Hayne, as he was loaded with irons, was unable to return the embrace of his son, and merely said to him in reply, "Live, my son; live to honor God by a good life; live to serve your country; and live to take care of your brother and little sisters." The next morning, proceeds the narrative of these distressing events, Colonel Hayne was conducted to the place of execution. His son accompanied him. Soon as they came in sight of the gallows, the father strengthened himself, and said, "Now, my son, show yourself a man! That tree is the boundary of my life, and of all my life's sorrows. Beyond that the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest. Don't lay too much at heart our separation; it will be short. 'Twas but lately your dear mother died. To-day I die. And you, my son, though but young, must short-

ly follow us." "Yes, my father," replied the broken-hearted youth, "I shall shortly follow you; for, indeed, I feel that I cannot live long." And his melancholy anticipation was fulfilled in a manner more dreadful than is implied in the mere extinction of life. On seeing his father in the hands of the executioner, and then struggling in the halter, he stood like one transfixed and motionless with horror. Till then, proceeds the narration, he had wept incessantly; but soon as he saw that sight, the fountain of his tears was stanched, and he never wept more. He died insane, and in his last moments often called on his father, in terms that brought tears from the hardest hearts.*

We ask the favor of the reader's attention to one melancholy instance more. — Near the close of the last century, there was a family in France; their name and place of residence are not given by the narrator; but this the reader may be assured of, that the members of the family, as is the case generally, were tenderly attached to each other. Under the system of conscription, which has so long prevailed in France, two brothers of this family were required to leave their home, and enter the army. They had joined the army but a short time, when they were called into action. In the heat of the engagement, one of these young men was killed by a musket ball, as he stood by the side of his brother. "The survivor, petrified with horror, was struck motionless at the sight. Some days afterwards, he was sent, in a state of complete idiotism, to his father's house. His arrival produced a similar impression upon a third son of the same family. The news of the death of one of the brothers, and the derangement of the other, threw this third victim into a state of such consternation and stupor

* Life of Marion, as quoted in Thatcher's Military Journal, p. 208.

as might have defied the powers of ancient or modern poetry to give an adequate representation of it. My sympathetic feelings (says M. Pinel, who at that time had charge of the Bicetre Hospital, and has given the account) have been frequently arrested by the sad wreck of humanity presented in the appearance of these degraded beings; but it was a scene truly heart-rending to see the wretched father come to weep over these miserable remains of his once enviable family."

Such instances as have now been given, show us how exceedingly those are mistaken, who imagine that the horrors of war are chiefly limited to the person of the soldier, and the boundaries of the battle-field. Happy would it be if such were the case. We might indeed consider ourselves as having great occasion to rejoice, if it could be satisfactorily shown that none but the poor soldiers, with their mangled limbs and dying agonies, are doomed to suffer in consequence of wars. But the soldier, vicious and degraded as he too often is, has yet his friends and relatives, who have watched over him, and perhaps prayed over him, with the deepest affection and solicitude; some father, gray-headed and bowed down with years; some mother, in whose withered and decrepit form the passion of maternal love still glows with its inherent intensity; some sister, who, amid the distressing perplexities and contumelies of life, consoles herself with the recollection that there is one, whom, although less worthy than he ought to be, she can still call a brother. But the news comes suddenly from the field of battle that he has fallen, that his manly form has been torn and crushed by the instruments of death, and that they have a son and a brother no longer. Then, indeed, is it true that gray hairs are brought down with sorrow to the grave. But how much greater is their grief, when the victim of war, whose death they lament, was adorned not

only with the graces of form, but with every quality that is kind and amiable, with every trait that is pure, virtuous, and ennobling! Many are the individuals, doomed to fall on the fields of battle, over whose accomplishments and virtues, rival nations, that could agree in nothing else, have united in shedding the tear of heart-felt sorrow. But what can be their grief, who have beheld the lustre of those accomplishments and virtues only in the dim distance, compared with the sorrow of those near friends and relatives, in whose arms they first budded into life, and on whose bosoms they have shone from infancy! — Writers have from time to time given us the statistics of armies; it would, perhaps, be no difficult task for them to furnish the statistics of battle-fields, prison-ships, and military hospitals; but who is able, except that God without whom not even a sparrow falls, to give the statistics of the sighs and tears, the groans and the broken hearts, of wretched parents, of mourning brothers and sisters, of desolate widows and orphans! We close this article by giving an extract from Grahame's British Georgics. Poets have often done injury by clothing the pomp and the heroic achievements of war in the enchantments of verse, and thereby encouraging a military spirit; happy will it be, when their lyre, so full of delight, and so potent in its influence, shall be attuned to the celebration of the arts of benevolence and peace; and happier will it be than it now is, when, as in the present instance, they paint the sufferings and blighting influence, rather than the factitious charms and glories, of international strife.

"Once I beheld a captive, whom the wars
Had made an inmate of the prison-house,
Cheering with wicker-work (that almost seemed
To him a sort of play) his dreary hours.
I asked his story. In my native tongue,
(Long use had made it easy as his own,)
He answered thus: Before these wars began,

I dwelt upon the willowy banks of Loire.
I married one who from my boyish days
Had been my playmate. One morn, I'll ne'er forget,
While choosing out the fairest little twigs,
To warp a cradle for our child unborn,
We heard the tidings, that the conscript-lot
Had fallen on me. It came like a death-knell.
The mother perished; but the babe survived;
And, ere my parting day, his rocking couch
I made complete, and saw him sleeping smile —
The smile that played erst on the cheek of her
Who lay clay cold. Alas! the hour soon came
That forced my fettered arms to quit my child.
And whether now he lives to deck with flowers
The sod upon his mother's grave, or lies
Beneath it by her side, I ne'er could learn.
I think he's gone; and now I only wish
For liberty and home, that I may see,
And stretch myself, and die upon the grave."

CHAPTER THIRD.

INFLUENCE OF WAR ON THE MORALS OF SOLDIERS.

The evils of war, in almost every possible point of view, have been pointed out. One form of those evils, however, has not arrested that attention, to which it seems to be justly entitled; we refer to the influence of war on the moral and religious character of the soldiers themselves. It is not necessary to assert that the evil which is now referred to is one of the greatest resulting from a state of war; but it is certainly an evil so considerable as richly to deserve the notice of the philanthropist. In making this remark, we do not permit ourselves to forget that the moral and religious improvement of the human race is one of the greatest objects to which the attention of mankind can be directed. Certainly, when we consider that this object was one of the most effective in bringing the Son of God down from heaven, this statement will not be likely to be regarded as an exaggerated one. And can it be pretended that the moral and religious improvement of the soldier is less important than that of other men? On the supposition, therefore, that the moral and religious interests of the soldier are not less real and urgent than those of other classes of persons, we are prepared to enter into an examination of the circumstances in which he is placed, considered in their bearing upon moral and religious character. And, accordingly, we do not hesitate to assert that the life of a soldier is decidedly adverse to sound morals, and particularly to religion.

In proof of this assertion, we might rely, without going into particulars, on the *prima facie* evidence

which is every where presented. Who has ever supposed, or believed, that large armies were remarkable for the purity and strictness of their morals? Who has ever heard, with some rare and marked exceptions, of special attention to religion in the military encampment? Undoubtedly there have been at various times some distinguished soldiers, who have been men of religion. Such seems to have been the character of Colonel Gardiner, who was killed at the battle of Preston Pans. And such, probably, was the character of many of the soldiers and officers (among others, Fleetwood, Harrison, Goffe, Whalley, and perhaps Cromwell himself) who bore a conspicuous part in the great English revolution of 1640. It is almost literally true, that the soldiers on the parliament or commonwealth side fought and prayed at the same time, with the sword in one hand, and the Bible in the other. It is a fact, probably without a parallel in the history of war, that early in the contest an attempt was made to raise some new regiments for the parliament's army, to be composed chiefly of truly religious men. This was done at the suggestion of Cromwell, who, as he held at that time a subordinate military station, proposed the measure to the celebrated Hampden. The latter, at first, thought the plan impracticable, but still seems to have carried it into effect by means of Cromwell's assistance. Cromwell says that, when he first went into engagement, he saw his men beaten on every side; but afterwards, when he had "raised such men as had the fear of God before them, and made conscience of what they did," he was always successful against the enemy.* But these are obviously rare instances, and are justly to be regarded as exceptions to the general statement. As a general thing, it is true, beyond all question, that among sol-

* Godwin's History of the Commonwealth of England, Book IV. chap. 23.

diers, particularly in large armies, there is a deplorable laxity both of moral and religious principle and feeling. But it is certainly a reasonable conclusion, that such a state of things could not so generally exist, unless there were something in the very situation of a soldier, which is opposite, and *fatally* opposite, to the cultivation of principles and feelings of this kind.

But, without resting satisfied with this general statement, it is proper to enter into the examination of some particulars. And, in the first place, the soldier is removed from those many favorable and powerful influences, which result from domestic life and from the general relations of society. The young man, who remains at home beneath his father's roof, surrounded by his relatives and friends, is encircled on all sides by cords, invisible, indeed, to the eye, and so light in their pressure as to be scarcely perceptible, which have an immense power in restraining the ebullitions of the passions and improprieties of conduct. He knows that the ever-watchful and affectionate eye of his father and mother is upon him; he knows that a sister's love is feelingly and deeply alive to every thing he says and does; he knows that his numerous relatives and friends, whom he meets at almost every hour of the day, have an interest in his deportment and character, which he cannot disregard, without a violation of every sentiment of honor and benevolence. The influence from these sources is far stronger than is sometimes imagined; and we should hardly go too far in saying that it constitutes one of the greatest sureties and supports of civil government. But the soldier is removed, in a great measure at least, beyond the reach of this propitious control. Separated from his home, and from all those restraining and regulative influences, of which home is the great centre and source, he finds himself in a situation where he can indulge his passions without being subject to any observation of which he stands

in awe, and give loose to improprieties of deportment without so clearly perceiving and feeling that he himself is dishonored, and that his dearest friends are injured by it. He is transplanted from a scene and a situation where every thing is rendered sacred by domestic affection, and oftentimes by the observances and benign spirit of religion, to a soil and atmosphere that give birth and nourishment to every thing noxious and pestilential. No father's warning voice checks him in his mad career; no mother's tear gives strength to the suggestions of virtue; no brother's or sister's hand compulsively, yet kindly, withholds him from the haunts of dissipation and vice; but, on the contrary, he finds himself launched suddenly on the great ocean of temptation and vice, under a full press of sail, and left at the entire mercy of the winds and waves.

But the soldier is not only removed from those influences of domestic life, so favorable to a course of virtue, but is placed directly under the pressure of other influences, of a wholly opposite character, tending directly to vice. In other words, he is surrounded by men whose character is essentially vicious, and constantly breathes the deleterious atmosphere of their example and advice. It is a just remark of Dr. Doddridge, in respect to the military life, "The temptations are so many, that it may seem no inconsiderable praise and felicity to be free from dissolute vice, and to retain what in other professions might be regarded a mediocrity of virtue." * It is not our object to go into the particulars of those vices, which are undoubtedly prevalent, in a very high degree, in all armies. It is sufficient for our purpose merely to allude to them. Among other vices, which display themselves openly, and are constantly disseminating their pernicious

* Doddridge's Remarkable Passages in the Life of Colonel James Gardiner

contagion, are intemperance, profanity, gambling, Sabbath-breaking, &c., which of themselves, without being accompanied by others of so depraved and impure a nature as hardly to admit of being named, are enough to corrupt and ruin any body of men. A young man is taken from the bosom of a family, where he had been accustomed to hear the name of God mentioned with reverence, where the Sabbath had been seriously and scrupulously regarded, and where every thing around him had breathed of uprightness and purity, and is plunged at once in this sea of sin. And can we expect that he will remain there without deep and dreadful contamination? We do not say that it is absolutely impossible. But can we rationally expect it? His ear becomes habituated to profaneness; the Sabbath's light, that once had a degree of sacredness, has ceased to bring its customary stillness, and its solemnity, and its religious instructions; every thing around him invites to the prostitution of his faculties, and to vicious indulgences; and, after some feeble efforts to sustain a propriety and decency of character, he falls, the ruined victim of the pernicious influences under which he is placed.

Furthermore, there is something in the very nature of a military life, even if all the concomitant influences were unexceptionable, which tends to moral evil. — Even if it could be shown that war is in some cases justifiable and right, (a matter upon which we do not here propose to express an opinion,) it would still remain true that the military life has, in itself considered, a pernicious tendency. The appropriate business of the soldier is bloodshed, the taking away of human life. But this sanguinary business, whatever plausible reasons may sometimes be brought forward to justify it, jars violently upon all the finer feelings and susceptibilities of our nature. If a person can be made to feel that it is right to cut down his fellow-man, to mar and destroy that image which God alone

could make, he will be in a fair way to believe tha any thing, and every thing whatever, may be either right or wrong; in other words, to believe that the doctrine of moral distinctions is altogether unfounded and false. But the fact is, that a large proportion of the soldiers, perhaps nine tenths of them, never form an opinion, founded on a careful and candid examination of all the facts in the case, of the justice or injustice of the war in which they are engaged. They slay their fellow-men, without having formed any deliberate opinion whether the action in that particular case is right or wrong. They imbrue their hands in blood with much the same carelessness and indifference with which a butcher sheds the blood of an ox or a lamb. To a large portion of the soldiers it is butchery, and nothing but butchery, and, from their inability to inquire into the full merits of the war, must necessarily be so. Military life, therefore, when we properly analyze it, becomes, to the common soldier, the mere dreadful business of the *butchery* of human beings; nothing more and nothing less. Now, we assert that this business, so abhorrent to all the kindly feelings of our nature, necessarily tends to undermine the moral character. It requires no remarkable clearness of perception to see that the butchery, the putting to death of our fellow-beings in the way which has been mentioned, will fill the mind with a sort of instinctive abhorrence. No soldier, who fights without having satisfied himself of the entire rectitude of his cause, (a state of things which, as we have seen, is, for the most part, wholly out of the question,) slays another in battle for the first, second, or third time, without hearing a warning voice within him, which denounces it as a deed of murder. Nature will be found to assert her rights, even in the bosom of military men. She will not fail to speak, and to speak in such a manner as to make herself heard; but her remonstrances will be in vain; the subject of them will at

once place himself in the attitude of resistance; the pressure of his situation will compel him to harden himself against the calls of sympathy and of moral right; and, although they are heeded for a time, as they must necessarily be, they are ultimately silenced. This is the natural, and, we may add, the *inevitable* course of things. The life of a soldier is necessarily a continued and rapid process of moral induration; so much so, that not unfrequently he who went forth from his father's home a human being endued with human feelings, returns with the guilt, and cruelty, and stupidity, and hardness, of a monster. It is not our intention here, nor in any part of this work, to make statements at hazard, nor to assert any thing which is not abundantly warranted by the facts of history. In the wars of Vespasian, "a common soldier," says Tacitus, "belonging to the cavalry, averred that, in the late engagement, he killed his brother; and for that deed of horror he had the hardiness *to demand a recompense.*" In the same civil wars, Julius Mansuetus, a member of the legion RAPAX, (a significant and appropriate name for a Roman legion,) was slain in battle by his own son. The son, who was yet young, and in whom the process of moral hardening had not reached the highest point, was sensibly affected on the discovery of what he had done. He opened a grave, and with filial affection, raising the body in his arms, buried it. But what is the commentary of Tacitus on this event? "This pathetic scene did not escape observation. A few drew near, others were attracted, and in a short time the fatal deed was known throughout the army. The soldiers heaved a sigh, and with curses execrated the frantic rage of civil discord. And yet, with those sentiments, they *went the next moment to plunder their slaughtered friends, their relations, and brothers. They called it a crime, and yet repeated what their hearts condemned.*" Time will not permit us to multiply instances; but we appeal to

those to whom the history of wars, particularly of civil wars, is familiar, and we assert, without the fear of contradiction, that the military life is not capable of being sustained, on the part of the great body of soldiers, without a prostration, to a very considerable extent, of the great elements of our moral nature. And, under these circumstances, it would certainly be in vain to expect from them any marked regard for religion.

In addition to all that has been said, we proceed to remark further, that soldiers are left destitute, in a great degree, of that moral and religious instruction, which is so necessary to the full development of man's moral and religious character. It is true that chaplains are sometimes provided for regiments and garrisons; but this is done only to a small extent. Of the chaplains actually employed, whether more or less in number, is it uncharitable to assert, that there is a large proportion who are not imbued with that decisive and deep religious feeling which is requisite to the successful discharge of the duties of that office? The fact is, that men deeply imbued with the spirit of religion, and filled with earnest desire to win souls to the Savior, are exceedingly unwilling to place themselves in a situation where there is so little prospect of doing good. They know that the influences of military life are in themselves positively and powerfully adverse to impressions and influences of a moral and religious kind. Even admitting the lawfulness of their calling, (which is very questionable, as we shall hereafter have occasion to see,) still they find their minds burdened, and almost entirely prostrated, as to all effective effort, by the oppressive conviction that they are casting pearls before swine; that their admonitions are like water spilt upon the ground, that will never be gathered up.

What, then, viewing the subject in all its bearings, must be the moral and religious prospects of a man

who enters upon a course of military life? Can any situation, in a Christian land, be more unfavorable to the existence and growth of those moral and religious principles and habits, which are requisite to the perfection of our nature in this life, as well as to the happiness of the life to come? Is it not almost certain, that, under the constant and deplorable pressure of such a multitude of adverse circumstances, the great body of the soldiery in every country will become vicious in principle and practice? and that, even after their return from the military ranks, they will be utterly lost to their friends and society, as well as to themselves? And are we permitted, as men and as Christians, wholly to disregard this melancholy state of things? While we are doing something for the slave, and the prisoner, and the benighted heathen, shall we turn no eye of sympathy towards the moral condition of the soldier?

But it will be said, perhaps, that the evil now complained of is and must be small, inasmuch as soldiers make but a small portion of the whole community. This suggestion, if properly followed out, will show the magnitude, rather than the smallness, of the evil. Even at this moment of comparative peace and quietude in the civilized world, what immense armies are kept on foot! The standing army of Russia may, without any exaggeration, be estimated at 700,000 men, and it has sometimes been placed as high as a million. The standing army of France may be estimated at a number varying from 350 to 400,000. The number of the effective men of the standing army of Spain is given by Malte-Brun at 50,000; but he adds, if the invalids, pensioners, and men on the sick list, be included, the whole number may amount to 120,000. The army of Great Britain is 100,000 in time of peace; increased to 300,000 in time of war. According to the Weimar Statistical Almanac for 1830, the standing force of all the European

states in war, (and it is to be recollected that either actual war, or a careful and ample preparation for it, is the ordinary condition of the European states,) is 4,578,430. — And will any one say that the moral and religious interest of so vast a body of men is a concern too small to occupy the notice and to elicit the benevolence of the philanthropist? Let us remember that the soldier, corrupted as he is by immoralities, and stained by crime, is still a human being; that he has an immortal soul; that he has vast interests at stake; that he is subject, in common with others, to the great destinies of our race. Let us not turn from him with unmixed scorn and reproach, and haughtily leave him to his fate; but let us feel for him, and act for him, and pray for him, as for a brother.

We are aware that this view of the subject may not be so attractive as that which deals more in the horrible. It is certainly less exciting to the imagination; but we may well doubt whether it is less important. At any rate, it is a view which, in making an estimate of the great mass of evils attendant upon war, ought not to be overlooked, as has too often been the case.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

INFLUENCE OF WAR ON NATIONAL PROSPERITY.

In endeavoring to give some idea of the evils of war, we do not feel at liberty to let pass unnoticed its injurious effects on the national wealth and prosperity. — Wars tend not only to deprave the national morals, but to diminish the national resources. The supplies in the hands of the sovereign are at such times rapidly consumed; and hence it is necessary that constant draughts should be made upon the people; and those who would otherwise possess a competency, are often reduced to great want and suffering.

It is probably true, — and we would not be understood to deny it, — that some men are made rich by war. And this in a great degree accounts for it, that in seasons of war there are always some persons, and classes of persons, from whom larger and more generous views would be naturally expected, who are opposers to the return of peace. Mr. Jay, who was sent as envoy to England in 1794, states, in his Miscellaneous Correspondence, that he was invited to partake of a public dinner, in company with about two hundred British merchants, who were concerned in the American trade. Towards the conclusion of the feast, being asked for a toast, he proposed what he considered a neutral one, as follows: *A safe and honorable peace to all the belligerent powers;* referring, probably, in particular, to the war then raging between France and England. "You cannot conceive," he remarks to his correspondent, "how coldly it was received; and though civility induced them to give it three cheers, yet they were so faint and single,

as most decidedly to show that peace was not the thing they wished. They were *merchants.*" There are always such men to be found in time of war, — some classes of merchants, some manufacturers, some speculators in the public funds, some agents engaged in furnishing the military supplies, — with whom the war may be supposed to be popular, because, such is their peculiar situation, they happen to be made rich by it; men who, in the language of Johnson, " rejoice when obstinacy or ambition adds another year to slaughter and devastation, and laugh from their desks at bravery and science, while they are adding figure to figure, cipher to cipher, hoping for a new contract from a new armament, and computing the profits of a siege or tempest." But these persons are so few in number, — scarcely one in a thousand of the whole population, — that they are hardly to be thought of. We must look at the majority of the people, at the great mass; and not at a few grasping individuals, whose interests happen to lie in a different direction from that of the great body. And accordingly we may assert, with entire confidence, with the unimportant exception just referred to, that war cannot exist for any length of time, without certainly and rapidly bringing upon the nation engaged in it the deepest poverty and suffering.

In the FIRST place, the expense of supporting armies and navies is immensely great. M. Thiers, recently a distinguished member of the French chamber of deputies, estimates the annual expense of each soldier in France at 733 francs, or 131 dollars; of each soldier in Austria at 653 francs, or 117 dollars; of each soldier in Prussia at 1000 francs, or 180 dollars. The expense of maintaining each English soldier he estimates much higher than the expense of an Austrian, Prussian, or French soldier. And whether it be owing to this circumstance, or not, it seems to be the fact that, while other nations are greatly bur-

dened and depressed by the expenses incident to the maintenance of large armies, England is burdened and borne down in a still greater degree. Some years since, a statement was made, in the London Weekly Review, of the wars in which England has been engaged, and of the expenses incurred in consequence of them, which is worthy of particular attention. "Of 127 years, terminating in 1815, England spent 65 in war, and 62 in peace. The war of 1688, after lasting nine years, and raising our expenditure in that period to thirty-six millions, was ended by the treaty of Ryswick, in 1697. Then came the war of the Spanish succession, which began in 1702, concluded in 1713, and absorbed sixty-two and a half millions of our money. Next was the Spanish war of 1739, settled finally at Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1748, after costing us nearly fifty-four millions. Then came the seven years' war of 1756, which terminated with the treaty of Paris in 1763, in the course of which we spent one hundred and twelve millions. The next was the American war of 1775, which lasted eight years; our national expenditure in this time was one hundred and thirty-six millions. The French revolutionary war began in 1793, lasted nine years, and exhibited an expenditure of four hundred and sixty-four millions. The war against Bonaparte began in 1803, and ended in 1815; during those twelve years, we spent eleven hundred and fifty-nine millions, — 771 of which were raised by taxes, 388 by loans. In the revolutionary war we borrowed 201 millions; in the American, 104 millions; in the seven years' war, 60 millions; in the Spanish war of 1739, 29 millions; in the war of the Spanish succession, 32½ millions; in the war of 1688, 20 millions: — total borrowed in the seven wars, during 65 years, about 834 millions. In the same time, we raised by taxes, 1189 millions, — thus forming a total expenditure of 2023 millions!".

According to a recent publication, showing the extent, population, revenue, and debt, of the principal states of Europe for 1829, the debt of Russia was, at that time, £35,550,000; of Austria, £78,100,000; of France, £194,400,000; of Spain, £70,000,000; of Netherlands, including Belgium, £148,500,000; of Prussia, £29,701,000; of Great Britain, £819,600,000. These enormous masses of debt were incurred in consequence of wars. Great nations have been reduced to the necessity of going from city to city, and of borrowing, on almost any conditions, the money of their merchants. And it must be recollected that, during the whole period in which these debts, incurred for military purposes, have been accumulating, the people, harassed and bleeding at every pore, have been compelled to pay excessive taxes for the same object. Can a nation in such a condition, burdened with such debts, resulting from war, and at the same time overwhelmed with taxation for direct military purposes, be regarded as otherwise than miserably exhausted and wretched? And can there, so far as the national resources and wealth are concerned, be any reasonable doubt as to the injurious and destructive tendency of wars? "England and France," says Bonaparte in one of his conversations at St. Helena, "held in their hands the fate of the world, and particularly that of European civilization. What injury did we not do to each other! What good might we not have done! Under Pitt's system, [he says nothing of his own guilt,] we desolated the world; and what has been the result? You imposed on France a tax of fifteen hundred millions of francs, and raised it by means of Cossacks. I laid a tax of seven hundred millions [probably meaning pounds sterling] on you, and made you raise it with your own hands by your parliament. Even now, after the victory you have obtained, *who can tell whether*

you may not sooner or later sink under the burden?" * In this last inquiry, by whatever jealousy of spirit it might have been prompted in Napoleon, there is something worthy of the attention of the friends of England. Great Britain, with all the wealth of her cities and the grandeur of her nobles, with all the resources of her commerce, and the unrivalled skill of her manufactures, finds it difficult to conceal it from the world that her giant footsteps are treading on the brink of bankruptcy. If she falls, it will be the result of war, of *victorious* war; for war is destructive to the victors as well as the vanquished. If she sustains this great trial, which now presses so heavily on the resources of her genius, and the endurance of her patriotism, where is the recompense, either in the past or the present, for her starving operatives, her beggared peasantry, the millions of her ignorant and wretched population, whose cry and wailing, amid the hum of her manufactures and the roar of her mighty cities, so often come up, as if from the interminable depths, and thrill in the heart of philanthropy in the distant corners of the world?

In the SECOND place, we must take into view the loss suffered by the community, in consequence of the abstraction of the vast numbers that are employed in armies and navies, from *profitable* employments. A nation's resources are to be considered as diminished, not only by what it is compelled to pay, but also by what it might have saved to itself, from its own efforts, by taking a different course. The loss, in this point of view, is immense. In time of war, the land forces of Europe, as we have already had occasion to remark, amount to 4,578,430. And yet this vast body of men, consisting precisely of that portion which is most active and efficient, depend wholly upon others for their support; they do nothing of themselves towards this object; the whole burden of

* Las Casas, Pt. III. p. 40.

their maintenance is thrown upon others. As to all positively beneficial purposes, aside from the benefits which are commonly, though erroneously, supposed to be connected with war, they are mere drones in the social and political hive, — utterly useless. If these men were required to beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, — if they were permitted to remain in a situation where they could apply themselves to the business of agriculture, to the fisheries, to navigation, and the common arts of peace, — what beneficial results would speedily follow! The inhabitants at home would not only be freed from the immense expense attendant upon supporting them in idleness, but there would be a positive and rapid accession to the resources and wealth of the community, which would diffuse a vivifying and cheering influence through all classes of people, and all branches of industry. The face of nature and of the useful arts would be changed at once. What sterile and desolate tracts of country would be rendered fertile! what marshes would be reclaimed! what numbers of canals would be opened, and railroads erected! what an increase of the productions of the earth necessary for man's subsistence! what an impulse would be given to commerce!

The great cause of humanity, embraced in the gospel principle, THOU SHALT LOVE THY NEIGHBOR AS THYSELF, is but very imperfectly understood. Mankind are but just awaking to a perception of its glory. They begin to feel for their brother man; they begin to pity the heathen, and to send to them the missionary and the Bible; they begin to sympathize in the wretchedness of the slave, and are striving to break his chains; they begin to explore prisons and dungeons, and to shed the light of benevolence on those abodes of darkness; but this is only the first step, the commencement of a great work of benevolence, the length and breadth of which the most glowing philanthropists

have but imperfectly explored. It is indeed right that we should begin with those whose condition is the most debased and hopeless; but as the noble cause of philanthropy rolls on, it will be found that there is also a great work to be done *at home*. Every man must be furnished with his farm or his workshop; the means of moral and religious education must be brought to every man's door; every man must have it in his power to reap some enjoyment even in the present life, not, indeed, as a brute animal, rioting in the excess of passion, but as a rational and moral being; so that happy faces, radiant with intelligence and virtue, may be seen looking out from the humblest cottages, and even from workshops and manufactories.

But in vain shall we look for the realization of this delightful vision, so long as wars continue to exist. In consequence of the abstraction of soldiers from profitable pursuits, those who remain at home are compelled, without the least aid from the military portion of the nation, to bear the immense amount requisite for the support of armies and navies, in addition to the no small burden of the ordinary taxation. The number of those who pay is diminished, while they are compelled to pay a greatly increased sum. And this they are less able to do than they would otherwise be, in consequence of the direct destruction of their property, the devastation of their lands, and particularly the interruption of commerce and other civic pursuits by reason of a state of war. Scarcely able to support their families, and utterly unable to obtain for them many things exceedingly desirable for their convenience, and especially for their intellectual and moral improvement, they nevertheless find it impossible to evade the demands of the tax-gatherer, which are multiplied upon them in every shape. Their lands are taxed, their houses are taxed, their cattle are taxed, their persons are taxed, their

clothing is taxed, their bread, and salt, and tea, are taxed, the very light of heaven, in the shape of an impost on windows, is taxed; indeed, it is not easy to mention any thing which is free, not merely from taxation, but from *excessive* taxation.

This is no exaggeration. A writer in the Edinburgh Review, for January of 1820, undertakes to designate to Americans the inevitable consequences of *being too fond of glory*. And what are these inevitable consequences? "Taxes upon every article which enters into the mouth, or covers the back, or is placed under the foot — taxes upon every thing which it is pleasant to see, hear, feel, smell, or taste — taxes upon warmth, light, and locomotion — taxes on every thing on earth, and the waters under the earth — on every thing that comes from abroad, or is grown at home — taxes on the raw material — taxes on every fresh value that is added to it by the industry of man — taxes on the sauce which pampers man's appetite, and the drug that restores him to health — on the ermine which decorates the judge, and the rope which hangs the criminal — on the poor man's salt, and the rich man's spice — on the brass nails of the coffin, and the ribbons of the bride. At bed or board, couchant or levant, we must pay. The schoolboy whips his taxed top — the beardless youth manages his taxed horse, with a taxed bridle, on a taxed road — and the dying Englishman, pouring his medicine, which has paid 7 per cent., into a spoon that has paid 15 per cent., flings himself back upon his chintz bed which has paid 22 per cent., makes his will on an eight pound stamp, and expires in the arms of an apothecary who has paid a license of a hundred pounds for the privilege of putting him to death. His whole property is then immediately taxed from 2 to 10 per cent. Besides the probate, large fees are demanded for burying him in the chancel; his virtues are handed down to posterity on taxed marble; and

he is then gathered to his fathers, — to be taxed no more."

Now, what hope is there of competency and happiness, or even of a tolerable degree of comfort, for a man, in the common ranks of life, surrounded by the wants of a rising family, if the little he earns is to be thus plucked from his hands?

It is individuals that constitute the nation; and if the resources of individuals are diminished, those of the nation are diminished also. There is no fallacy more dangerous, and perhaps none more frequently committed, than to separate between the nation and the citizens of the nation. If the people are in mourning, if their fields and vineyards are desolate, if their children are slain on the field of battle, or prisoners in foreign lands, — no magic of illuminations, of monumental piles, and of triumphal processions, will make such a nation happy. Rachel will still mourn for her children, and refuse to be comforted. And here, as we have already had occasion to intimate, is the great source of mistake and illusion: we look at things in the aggregate, and do not contemplate them in their elements; we behold the whited sepulchre of national glory, and do not look at the death and horror within. The situation of the great mass of the people, who are the real constitutors and essence of the nation, is wholly overlooked by the promoters and advocates of war. The leaders of the nation, too rich and too elevated to feel the effects of the storm, which must smite somewhere with unmitigated fury, contemplate the splendor of their armies, and the proud banners of their floating military castles, and consider themselves increased in goods and glory, while the condition of the great body of citizens, for whom, in particular, government was instituted, is one of disappointment, poverty, and wretchedness. The vast majority of the community, in those nations that have plunged deeply into the practice of war, are compelled

to drag on their days without comfort for the present, and with as little hope for the future. Peace is banished from their firesides, and joy from their hearts, and light from their countenances; because their time, and strength, and substance, — to say nothing of the blood frequently poured out by the members of their own families, — are invaded and exacted, to support a vicious and idle multitude, whose business it is to consume and destroy without producing. These are the legitimate fruits of war; these are the evils flowing from a violation of the laws of God and nature, by shedding a brother's blood; these are the results to the miserable people, while kings, and military chieftains, and rulers of every grade, are either indifferent to their condition, or, rioting in their own abundance, make an open mockery of their wretchedness.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

INFLUENCE OF WAR ON THE PROGRESS OF CIVILIZATION.

In adverting to the evils of war, and in endeavoring to impress them upon the mind of the reader, it is important to take into account its unpropitious influence on what may be termed, in a single word, CIVILIZATION. The leading elements of a truly and highly civilized state of society are various; such as agriculture, the useful arts, the liberal or polite arts, literature, the domestic relations and duties, civil and religious institutions, &c. If we had it in our power to examine, at some length, each of these elements separately, we could not fail, with the utmost distinctness, to perceive the deleterious influence of war on that complex civilization, of which, in a great degree, they constitute the parts. Instead, however, of that minute examination of the subject, which would, perhaps, be desirable, we shall be obliged to leave it with the reader, with a few suggestions, made as briefly as possible, —

I. The cultivation of the soil, if we look at the subject with candor, and with a suitable regard to all its relations, will justly be esteemed an indispensable element of civilization. As men rise in the scale of being, as they more and more bring themselves under the influence of just and benevolent principles, the earth itself, as if conscious of so propitious a change, will begin to put forth, and to bloom more beautifully. But war always throws cultivation back; the soldier is called from his plough, and the vine of his cottage droops till his return. But this is not all; whole

provinces have been laid waste at once; houses, lands, cornfields, vineyards, all at once, as if by an overflow of lava or a blast of the sirocco. It would not be difficult to adduce instances and facts that would fill volumes. What was the result of the irruptions of the Huns and Vandals into Italy in this respect, as well as in others? Before that time, historians inform us that this beautiful country was cultivated to the highest pitch; but afterwards large tracts of land, not naturally barren or of little value, were covered with forests and marshes of vast extent.* Repeatedly, in the course of European wars, has the whole Palatinate been laid waste; not merely cities, but villages, country-seats, cottages, fields, gardens, every thing. The Ukraine, during the last century, was laid waste, in the same savage manner, by Catherine of Russia. Almost the whole of La Vendee, thickly peopled, as it was, with an industrious and rural population, and every where bearing the marks of a high state of culture, was subjected, during the French revolution, to a most horrid and complete devastation. The devastation of the Peninsula, by the armies of Napoleon, was almost as great. "Affecting traces (says a writer who was there at the time) of the invasion of this smiling country were every where to be seen. Cottages all roofless and untenanted, the unpruned vine, growing in rank luxuriance over their ruined walls, gardens, the shells of fine houses destroyed by fire, * * * * * * all proclaimed, silently, but forcibly, that I was travelling through a country which had been the theatre of war." †

It is unnecessary to recapitulate the horrid scenes of the Carnatic, of St. Domingo, of the Russian Provinces in the late war with France, — of Scio, of the Morea, and of other parts of Greece, in the re-

* Robertson's Charles V. Historical Illustrations, Note V.
† Recollections of the Peninsula, Phil. Ed. p. 185.

cent Greek war. On few has the hand of war borne more heavily than on the cultivators of the soil; and, perhaps, in no period of the world have they suffered more than in the last half century. In peaceful countries, the husbandman quietly moves behind his plough, or tends his flock in the shade of his native hills; but, when war rages, it is too often the case that they find themselves without flocks, fields, or home. With hearts bleeding under the experience of human crime and cruelty, they are obliged to adopt the language of Virgil's unfortunate shepherds:

"Nos patriæ fines et dulcia linquimus arva."

II. Not to speak of the useful arts, which, although less splendid in their pretensions, are not less propitious in their influence on the progress of civilization, it will surely not be maintained that war has been otherwise than unfavorable to the progress of the fine arts — sculpture, painting, architecture, and the like. The time has been, when Athens and Corinth — not to mention other distinguished cities of Greece — displayed the proud testimonials of their refinement in their temples, paintings, and statues; and we know not that any satisfactory reason can be given, why it is not now as it was then, except it be the devastations of war. In the year 410, the city of Rome was taken and pillaged by the Goths and Huns of Alaric. After the streets had been strewed with the dead of every age and condition, a violent assault was commenced upon the works of art. "The palaces of Rome," says Gibbon, in his history of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, "were rudely stripped of their splendid and costly furniture. The sideboards of massy plate, and the variegated wardrobes of silk and purple, were irregularly piled in the wagons, that always followed the march of a Gothic army. The most exquisite works

of art were roughly handled, or wantonly destroyed; many a statue was melted, for the sake of the precious materials; and many a vase, in the division of the spoil, was shivered into fragments by the stroke of the battle-axe." And yet Gibbon gives his readers to understand, and Robertson does not hesitate to confirm the statement, that far greater outrages than these were committed, when, at a much later period, the city of Rome was assaulted, and, during several months, was subjected to every species of cruelty and depredation by the soldiers of Charles V. So far as we have been able to perceive, the works of art have not, in any country, or in any age of the world, been respected by the invading and conquering army, whenever the removal or demolition of them was supposed to promote their objects. Mr. Southey, in his History of the Peninsular War, speaking of the Castle of Benevento, which he represents as superior to any thing of the kind in England, observes, "Every thing combustible was seized. Fires were lighted against these fine walls; and pictures of unknown value, the works, perhaps, of the greatest Spanish masters, and those of other great painters, who left so many of their finest productions in Spain, were heaped together as fuel." * And, what is remarkable, this was done, not by the enemies of Spain, but by those English allies who had come to defend her. So late as the year 1814, the British army, that entered the city of Washington, burnt down the Capitol, the president's house, and the public offices, destroying with them the national library, and a multitude of papers and documents of great value in a civil and historical point of view.

III. Science and literature, too, as well as the arts, suffer from a state of war. It is, indeed, said of one of the philosophers of Germany, that he calmly

* As quoted in the Harbinger of Peace, Vol. I. p. 47.

pursued his researches in the immediate neighborhood of the battle of Jena, undisturbed by the horrors around him. And there is an old story of Archimedes, (whether true or false is of but little consequence in the present inquiry,) that he was deeply engaged in solving a mathematical problem, ignorant of the fact that Syracuse had been assaulted and taken by the Romans. But, however this may be, no one will pretend that the ability to engage the mind in philosophic and literary researches at such a time is often possessed. It is absurd to suppose that the intellect can be kept steadily and profitably at work, while the heart is excited and rent by the angry passions. And such a state of excitement and anger is almost always attendant upon war, even when its thunders are heard at a distance, and its fires do not smite upon our own favored dwellings.

The history of all literature abundantly shows that quietude and retirement are favorable to the developments of refined intellect. It was amid the shades of Mantua that Virgil composed the Æneid; it was in the solitary vales of Vaucluse that Petrarch drew the breath of poetic inspiration; it was when blindness and misfortune had driven the great Milton into the depths of retirement, and not amid the bustle of politics and the conflict of arms, that he wrote his Paradise Lost. But we will not pursue this interesting topic further than merely to add, that it is an ancient idea, almost as old as the world itself, and is, no doubt, founded on observation and reflection, that the Muses, prompted by the instincts of their own high nature, flee from confusion and strife. If those who have solicited their favor have not mistaken their character, they seek retirement; the bustle and turmoil of arms grate horrible discord to their ears; they love to listen to rural sounds, the breath of winds, and the dash of waterfalls; they delight in the solitude

of forests, and the contemplative silence of Ægerian grottos.

IV. Civilization may be understood to suffer in all cases where there is an interruption of the principles and institutions of social life. And this is always the case in that numerous class of wars, more cruel and terrific, as a general thing, than any others, denominated Civil Wars. Look into the Jewish and Roman wars of this description, and see how family ties were sundered! Mark how brother was arrayed against brother, and father was arrayed against son! We have already given instances from Tacitus; the following, of an earlier date, but of the same character, is from Valerius Maximus: "The father of Caius Toranius," says this historian, "had been proscribed by the triumvirate. Caius Toranius, coming over to the interests of that party, discovered to the officers, who were in pursuit of his father's life, the place where he concealed himself, and gave them, withal, a description, by which they might distinguish his person when they found him. The old man, more anxious for the safety and fortunes of his son, than about the little that might remain of his own life, began immediately to inquire of the officers who seized him, whether his son was well, whether he had done his duty to the satisfaction of his generals. 'That son,' replied one of the officers, 'so dear to thy affections, betrayed thee to us; by his information thou art apprehended, and diest.' The officer, with this, struck a poniard to his heart, and the unhappy parent fell, not so much affected by his fate, as by the means to which he owed it." * We see here the effect of war upon social life; how it enters into the sacred retreat of families; how it sunders the most sacred ties, and converts bosoms that were

* As quoted and translated by Paley, Mor. Philos. Book I. chap. 5.

formed for mutual love, into the repository of the most hateful passions. What was the condition of social life, and of social institutions, in France, during the progress of the French revolution? Every man stood in fear of his neighbor; the great principle of sociality was broken at the fountain; suspicion, and mistrust, and terror, were written upon every countenance; the smile that enlightened the domestic hearth was quenched; even the members of the same family lost confidence in each other; they wrapped themselves up in a jealous and inhospitable selfishness, to the exclusion of those tender and amiable sentiments, which are the basis of social happiness; one dark image constantly haunted their troubled imaginations — the vision of the revolutionary tribunal, and the spectre of the bloody guillotine. The French invasion of Russia, in 1812, furnishes abundant instances of the effect of war upon the social feelings. "Henceforward," says Count Segur, "there was no fraternity in arms; there was an end to all society, to all ties; the excess of evils had brutified them. Hunger, devouring hunger, had reduced these unfortunate men to the brutal instinct of self-preservation, the only understanding of the most ferocious animals, and which is ready to sacrifice every thing to itself. A rough and barbarous nature seemed to have communicated to them all its fury. Like savages, the strongest despoiled the weakest; they rushed round the dying, and frequently waited not for their last breath. When a horse fell, you might have fancied you saw a famished pack of hounds. They surrounded him; they tore him to pieces; for which they quarrelled among themselves like ravenous dogs."

V. The religious life, and religious institutions, which constitute another of the great elements of CIVILIZATION, as well as the social life and social institutions, are made to feel the depressing and destruc-

tive influences of war. Without dwelling upon this topic, it will be sufficient to indicate a single view. We have reference to the well-known fact that armies take no cognizance of the Sabbath. Fortifications are erected on the Sabbath; soldiers are paraded on the same holy day. In Europe, the Sabbath is said to be more frequently selected than any other day for great military musters; armies are marched from place to place without any regard to the Sabbath; battles, as was the case at Waterloo, have been frequently fought on that day, probably more frequently than on any other; and both officers and soldiers are taught to regard the strict observance of the Sabbath as not only inconsistent with the necessities of war, but not unfrequently as a mere Protestant prejudice, which ought to have no place in minds of a more liberal turn. In this country, for more than a century, the Sabbath was observed by our conscientious forefathers with a great degree of strictness, and unquestionably with the most favorable results; but the French war, about the middle of the last century, and the revolutionary war, which followed soon afterwards, caused a great change in this respect. Since those wars, there has been a great relaxation in the observance of the Lord's day, which is acknowledged and lamented, but which it is not easy to recover from.

VI. All civil and political institutions, as well as social and religious, are unfavorably affected by a state of war. War always has been, and, so long as it continues to be practised, always *will* be, the bane of freedom. The liberty of Rome was overthrown by a skilful warrior; it was the power which military command and influence gave him, that enabled Cromwell to dissolve the parliament of England, and seize the reins of government; it was military power, centred in the person of Napoleon, which enabled him successfully to subdue and to hold in subjection the lib-

erty of France; and it is the evil influence of a military life which at this very moment disturbs, and perplexes, and casts a deep shadow over the cause of freedom in the republics of South America. When do we find the fundamental laws and constitutions of a state invaded? When do we find prisons filled with persons guilty of nothing which, in the ordinary condition of the community, would be considered a crime? When do we hear of proclamations of martial law? — a measure oftentimes bearing more severely upon the citizen than upon the enemy. When do we hear of suspensions of the trial by jury, and of suspensions of the writ of Habeas Corpus? All these things, bearing directly and most injuriously upon the cause of liberty, are the results, and almost the necessary results, of war.

Plutarch says of Philopœmen, "Nature, indeed, gave him such talents for command, that he knew not only how to govern according to the laws, but he knew *how to govern the laws themselves;*" a species of knowledge with which many other military leaders, of less talent and less principle than the Achæan commander, seem to have been familiar. It is the testimony of Plutarch, also, that the bloodthirsty Marius, who makes such a figure in Roman history, studied to raise new commotions in the Roman commonwealth, because he perceived that all his greatness arose from war. It was a saying of his, "*Inter arma silent leges.*" —— Civil and political liberty is, perhaps, more perfectly enjoyed in this country, than in any other. But ask any intelligent American citizen, whether our liberties would long continue, if we were obliged to support a standing army of a hundred, or even of fifty thousand men, and he will promptly answer, it would be a hopeless experiment. Nor is this mere republican jealousy. Enlightened men of other nations have expressed sentiments of similar import.

It is the remark of a man no less distinguished than Sir James Mackintosh, that "an army with the sentiments and habits which it is the system of modern Europe to inspire, is not only hostile to freedom, but *incompatible with it.*" *

VII. An enlightened humanity is to be regarded as one of the elements, and, we may add, one of the marked and prominent elements, of high CIVILIZATION. It will avail but little that the arts and literature are cultivated, and that civil institutions are erected on just and liberal principles, if the heart is at the same time to be infected with strife and cruelty. Can that be regarded as truly a civilized state, where men disregard the ties of nature, resist the appeals of suffering, and learn to sneer at scenes and situations over which unbiased nature would weep? But war always, sooner or later, leads to this; it tends, beyond all question, to restrict and to crush the operation of all the kindly sensibilities. It is said of Frederic the Great, that, during the war which he made against the queen of Hungary, he one night gave orders that every light in his camp should be extinguished by eight o'clock. Walking out at that time, in order to see for himself if all were dark, he noticed a light in the tent of a Captain Zeitern. He entered the tent, just as that officer was folding up a letter. "Zeitern knew him, and instantly fell on his knees to entreat his mercy. The king asked him to whom he had been writing. He answered that it was a letter to his wife, in order to finish which he had retained the candle a few moments. Frederic coolly ordered him to rise, and write one line more, which he would dictate. This line was to inform his wife, without any explanation, that, by such an hour the next day, he should be executed. The letter was then sealed, and Frederic himself took

* Vindiciæ Gallicæ, 2d London edition, p. 286.

charge of having it conveyed; and the next day the captain was shot." *

Is this civilization, or rather utter and unmitigated barbarism? It will be said, perhaps, that war has its *necessities*. We grant it. But the question here is, not whether there are necessities in war, but what are the results of those necessities. Do these necessities tend to promote or to depress civilization? to render men humane and benevolent, or hard-hearted and cruel in the highest degree?

Look again at the conduct of one with whom this same Frederic was impiously associated in the dismemberment of Poland, the empress Catherine of Russia. "The cruelties, the massacres, executed by the Russian commanders, under the express orders of their ruthless and blood-stained sovereign, the female Tiberius of modern times, make humanity shudder. Not content with the torrents of blood shed by her own semi-barbarous armies, she also incited the Zaporavians, a tribe of the most atrocious banditti, who dwelt among the cataracts of the Borysthenes, to massacre the Poles in the Ukraine. These wretches, who lived by blood and rapine, were too happy, with the prospect of impunity, to execute the wishes of the empress. The Ukraine was entirely laid waste, and the inhabitants put to death by means of the most inhuman and revolting tortures. The lowest calculation of the number of human beings who lost their lives in this indiscriminate massacre, is 50,000; the highest, 200,000." †

If a person wishes to know whether war is, or is not, destructive of those feelings of humanity and benevolence which constitute so prominent an element

* Ladd's Essays on Peace and War, No. 15. Foster's Essay on Decision of Character, Letter V.

† Dover's Frederic, Book V., who refers here for his authority to Ruhliere's Anarchie de la Pologne.

of civilization, let him read the history of the wars occasioned by the efforts of the Netherlands to secure their independence. Such was the complete demoralization attendant upon this war, that the Spaniards, in often-repeated instances, threw their Dutch prisoners overboard, who were so unfortunate as to fall into their hands at sea. This greatly exasperated the Dutch; so much so that the States General gave orders to Hautain, one of their naval commanders, to retaliate in the same cruel manner. It was not long before this officer took some Spanish soldiers, whom he found on board of certain English and German vessels; and, in obedience to his orders, *five companies of them were tied together in pairs, and at a given signal were thrown alive into the ocean.**

It is needless to multiply instances further, or to add any thing more on this general topic. As war, in its very nature, involves that hostility and violence which are characteristic of barbarism, so it effectually tends to make men barbarians; it tends to eradicate all the kindly and generous sensibilities; it throws men back in the scale of civilization, and reduces them to a condition of recklessness, stupidity, and cruelty, characteristic of the lowest and vilest brute animals. Nor are we sure that this language is strong enough. It is here, in this melancholy view of men's conduct, that we find ourselves not disposed to object to one of the aphoristic sayings of Coleridge, — "If a man is not rising upwards to be an angel, depend upon it, he is sinking downwards to be a devil. He cannot stop at the beast. The most savage of men are not beasts; *they are worse, a great deal worse.*"

* Roman's Annals of the Troubles in the Netherlands, Vol. II. p. 54.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

INFLUENCE OF WAR UPON MISSIONS.

It is not one of the least evils of war, numerous and aggravated as they are, that it is a great obstacle in the way of the successful prosecution of the missionary enterprise. The missionary comes to the heathen with that simplicity and purity of views appropriate to his character, and announces a new and better religion, full of benignity, love, and peace. It is undoubtedly a great announcement, calculated to startle and arouse the attention of the most ignorant and prejudiced. But, unfortunately for the missionary, the heathen whom he addresses are already too well acquainted with the character of those professedly Christian nations from whom he comes The missionary announces to them, as one great element of the gospel, that it induces men to renounce strife and contention, to love each other, and to treat all mankind as their brethren. But they at once exhibit their incredulity; they state to him that the people from whom he comes, and who have heard the disclosures of the gospel from their childhood, are continually in conflict; they themselves have heard the roar of their cannon; they have seen the flash of their swords; nay, more, their own families have been assaulted; their own houses have been rifled; their own beloved children have been torn away, and carried into captivity, by men who called themselves Christians. This is not a mere picture of the imagination. Many are the missionaries, beyond all question, who can testify, with hearts rent and bleeding at the misconduct of their own countrymen, that it is

even so. Mr. Medhurst, an English missionary at Batavia, once presented a tract to a Malay. The Malay, on receiving it, said to the missionary, "Are you coming to teach me this new religion? Look at your own countrymen; they live worse than we do." It is said that the emperor of China gave, as a reason for refusing the admittance of the Christian religion into his empire, that, "*wherever Christians go, they whiten the soil with human bones.*" A Turk, at Jerusalem, once said to Wolff, the missionary, "Why do you come to us?" The missionary replied, "To bring you peace." "Peace!" replied the Turk, leading him to a window, and pointing to Mount Calvary; "there! upon the very spot where your Lord poured out his blood, the Mohammedan is obliged to interfere to prevent Christians from shedding the blood of each other!" *

We are at this moment endeavoring to give the gospel, and all the blessedness of the gospel, to the remnants of the savage tribes within our own limits. But what is the language, which, beyond all question, multitudes of these poor Indians utter, in their hearts at least, in answer to the most persuasive invitations? "You bring us the gospel of love and peace; but how can we accept it, or have any confidence in its value, when it has so little effect upon your own countrymen? They have been among us, and we know what they are. They have cheated us out of our lands; they have violated the most solemn treaties, guarantying to us the little that was left; they have brought fire and sword; they have burnt our wigwams; they have killed our wives and our little ones; we are desolate; how can we receive your gospel?"

We are, at this very moment, sending missionaries to Syria and Palestine; but, upon that very spot,

* Calumet, July 1831, Sept. 1834.

dreadful have been the conflicts of Christians, if it be not a sort of sacrilege to give them that holy name. Are the inhabitants of Syria and Palestine ignorant — is it possible that they should be ignorant — of the selfish, rapacious, and violent character of nations reputedly Christian? Have not those countries (saying nothing of the crimes and devastations connected with the crusades, of which there are undoubtedly traditionary recollections of a character by no means fitted to propitiate their present rulers) been the scenes, even recently, of fierce and horrid battles? We refer particularly to the invasion of these countries by the French, in 1799, the capture of Jaffa, the attack on St. Jean d'Acre, and the other military operations of that period. Recall the history of those events. In a letter of Bonaparte to Marmont, dated Jan. 9th, 1799, he says, "The capture of Jaffa was brilliant. *Four thousand of the best troops of Djezzar were put to death.*" And how were they put to death? Writing to Kleber, 9th March, 1799, he says, "At Jaffa, the garrison consisted of 4000 of the best troops; 2000 were put to the sword, and 2000 *I ordered to be shot within* 24 *hours.*" After such displays of violence and cruelty by men coming from Christian countries, the missionary makes his appearance, and announces the gospel of peace. Will not the Arab and the Mohammedan point to the ruins of Jaffa and St. Jean d'Acre? Will they not point to their devastated fields, their burning houses, the bones of their slaughtered countrymen, and say, and with reason, too, "We have no confidence in your gospel"? We ask the Christian public to reflect upon these things, and to inquire, seriously, whether they have any reason to expect that, while they hold the sword with one hand, the proffer of the gospel with the other will be attended with any adequate success. Have they any reason to believe that

God looks upon such a course with approbation? They may depend upon it that the world will not be converted, nor will any marked success attend the missionary cause, — which, even now, with all the aid of missionary publications and monthly concerts, seems to be obstructed and languishing, — until this great question is settled.

But some will perhaps object that these are solitary and exempt cases, and that a great portion of the heathen world are not thus acquainted with the vices and crimes of Christians. We wish it were so; but it is not. The roar of Christian cannon, and the flash of Christian musketry, and the hyæna outcry of the Christian military onset, have been heard and seen wherever there are men. We are sending missionaries, not only to our own heathen tribes, and to Syria and Palestine, but to India. Does India know nothing of the character of Christian nations, and of the hostility of that character to Christian principles? Have not the armies of England, at different times, and under different leaders, laid waste her fairest provinces, burnt her villages, and exemplified, to an extent deeply painful to every feeling heart, the tremendous crimes which are capable of being found in association with the sacred, but perverted, names of civilization and Christianity? "There is nothing," says a celebrated English orator, speaking of one of the principal agents in the transactions of British India, then on trial, "to be found in the history of human turpitude, — nothing in the nervous delineations and penetrating brevity of Tacitus, — nothing in the luminous and luxuriant pages of Gibbon, or of any other historian, dead or living, who, searching into measures and characters with the rigor of truth, presents to our abhorrence depravity in its blackest shapes, — which can equal, in the grossness of the guilt, or in the hardness of heart with which it was

conducted, or in low and grovelling motives, the acts and character of the prisoner." * And such are the pioneers of the gospel; such are the men who, in the lamentable ubiquity of human avarice and crime, have ever been destined to present to the hungering and thirsting nations of heathenism the antepast of the religion of purity and peace. And has this great evil been sufficiently contemplated and examined by the Christian church? We call it a *great* evil; not only because it is so in itself and in its own nature, but because it is great in its application, — because it is found *every where*, pervading every island, and every continent, and every country, and every name and tribe under heaven. It is a fatal mistake which some will be likely to commit, that, though the evil is aggravated in its nature, it is limited and curtailed in its application, and consequently of no great moment.

Fleeing from the abominations of America and India, we direct our attention to the immense regions of Africa. As the missionary passes along that benighted coast with his announcement of the glad tidings of salvation and peace, can it be supposed that the countless wrongs and contumelies, suffered for three centuries at the hands of Christian nations, will at once be forgotten? Undoubtedly, the missionary will find in the recollection of these wrongs an obstacle of the most serious kind to his benevolent efforts. The untutored Africans will experience the greatest difficulty in satisfactorily solving the problem of the direct contradiction between alleged Christian principles and known Christian practice; and, so long as this is the case, it cannot be expected that their hearts will be thrown fully and frankly open to the reception of divine truth. "We give you the

* Speech of Sheridan on the Impeachment of Warren Hastings.

gospel," says the missionary; "we come to you in peace; and we pray you to listen to us, and to become Christians." "O," says the bereaved and heart-broken mother, "rather give me my wretched sons and daughters, whom you Christians have torn shrieking from my arms, and have plunged into the ocean, or have enslaved in distant lands."

And now, what is to be done? Have we not, by our misconduct, erected a Chinese wall in the way of the progress of the gospel? Can we reasonably expect to purify the world without a purification of ourselves? Undoubtedly missions will be established, and will be attended with some degree of success; but we draw our conclusion without looking closely and seriously enough at the premises, if we suppose that the world will be converted without our taking this great stumbling-block out of the way. Ships of war must be laid up; armies must be disbanded; the militia system must be given up; fortifications must be demolished; cannon must be melted into bells for churches; swords must be beaten into ploughshares, and spears into pruning-hooks; and then what light will beam from the brow of the missionary, as he stands, the messenger of the *Prince of Peace*, on heathen soil! He will come, not only with the gospel, but with a practical commentary on its principles, so full, so striking, so overwhelming, as to carry conviction at once to the heathen heart.

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

CAUSES OF WAR.

It would be an interesting topic, if our limits would permit us to enter into a full examination of it, to show on how very slight causes wars generally depend. We sometimes find an alleviation of our regret at the issues of events, by a consideration of the causes which led to them. It is a common remark, that we ought to be willing to suffer in a good cause. But how very seldom does this source of consolation exist in the case of wars! We should naturally anticipate that war, involving, as it does, such a vast amount of human life and happiness, would not be commenced, except for the most urgent and weighty reasons. But nothing can be farther from the truth than such a supposition. Some years since, the Peace Society of Massachusetts appointed a committee to inquire into this subject. In the report, the inquiry is "confined to wars, in which civilized nations have been engaged since they became Christian, or since Constantine assumed the reins of the Roman empire, — omitting a great number of petty wars in small nations of antiquity, temporary insurrections, or trivial hostilities, and a multitude of wars which have been carried on between Christian and savage nations, such as the aborigines of Asia and America. The report relates to 286 wars of magnitude, in which Christian nations have been engaged. These are divided into the eleven following classes," viz.: —

"44 wars of ambition, to obtain extent of country.
22 wars for plunder, tribute, &c.
24 wars of retaliation or revenge.
8 wars to settle some question of honor or prerogative.
6 wars arising from disputed claims to some territory.
41 wars arising from disputed titles to crowns.
30 wars commenced under pretence of assisting an ally.
23 wars originating in jealousy of rival greatness.
5 wars which have grown out of commerce.
55 civil wars.
28 wars on account of religion, including the crusades against the Turks and heretics."

286

We should naturally infer from the most superficial view of the causes enumerated in this report, that many of them are very slight; but a more full examination would probably fill us with astonishment. Examine, for instance, those wars which have arisen from a jealousy of rival greatness, or from a determination to settle some question of honor or prerogative, and it will be seen how little truth, justice, and a due consideration of the consequences, have had to do with their origin. In the eleventh century, the commonwealth of Modena was involved in war. It originated in consequence of some soldiers of that state running away with a bucket from a public well belonging to the state of Bologna. The bucket was, of course, of very little value, and was taken, perhaps, in the mere wantonness of sport; but the circumstance of its being thus taken had the effect to wound the pride of the Bolognese, and to kindle up a long and bloody war. We do not propose, however, to go into a narrative of facts; we appeal to the historical

recollections of the reader himself, from the ten years' war of Troy, down to the bloody contests of England and Holland for the nominal supremacy of the ocean.

Although we are sometimes obliged to take the statements of Dean Swift, who understood the art of making a thing ridiculous by skilful exaggerations, with some grains of allowance, there is no need of any abatement in what he has said of the causes of war. "Sometimes," he remarks, "a war between two princes is to decide which of them shall dispossess a third of his dominions, whereto neither of them pretend to any right. Sometimes one prince quarrelleth with another for fear the other should quarrel with him. Sometimes a war is entered upon, because the enemy is too strong, and sometimes because he is too weak. Sometimes our neighbors want the things that we have, or have the things that we want; and we both fight till they take ours, or give us theirs."

There is one aspect of this subject which seems to demand a moment's further attention. It is a most melancholy truth, that the human race, with all their unspeakable interests, have been made the mere sport and playthings *of those in power*. It is not generally the case, that the nation itself, the great mass of the people, plunges into war by its own choice. It is the work of their rulers; sometimes from pure malignity and cruelty, but still more frequently from a cold and selfish indifference to every thing, except their own personal freaks, pleasures, and ambition. Machiavel has somewhere given an account of a dispute concerning the making of a pair of gloves, in which a certain royal personage was involved, which had the effect to change the aspect of affairs in all Europe And an incident almost as trifling as this, the most trivial affair imaginable, one which in private life should not have been

esteemed important enough to set two neighbors at variance, has often plunged nations in blood. That truly distinguished philosopher, Dugald Stewart, in giving an account of those principles in men, which lead them to action, has some remarks to this effect: that the cruelties which boys so frequently practise upon inferior animals, are not so much owing to a really malevolent disposition, as to their love of activity, and the pleasure they take in the exercise of power. And does not this remark, as well as what we know of the ambition, and of the malevolent tendencies of the human heart, suggest the explanation of a multitude of wars? Kings, and the other great rulers of mankind, kill their subjects, and set their subjects to killing each other, and bring upon them, directly and indirectly, the deepest poverty and wretchedness, — not because they in all cases, or even generally, love to witness suffering for suffering's sake, but because they wish to have something to do, because they love to be in motion, because they take a pleasure in activity and the exercise of power; in a word, because they think only of themselves, and of their own personal gratifications, and of nobody else. There is a passage in Voltaire's History of Louis XV. on this subject, worthy of some notice. Speaking of the war of 1756, in which the French nation had been engaged, he remarks: "This nation lost, in the course of this unfortunate war, a great part of the flower of its youth; more than half of the current money of the kingdom, its navy, commerce, and credit. It was believed that it was very easy to have prevented all these misfortunes, by giving up to the English a little piece of litigated ground towards Canada. But some ambitious persons, *to make themselves necessary and important*, plunged France into this fatal war. It was the same in the year 1741. The selfishness of two or three individuals is sufficient to desolate all Europe." The

same writer informs us that Louis XIV. once gave orders for the entire laying waste and destruction of the whole Palatinate, — a beautiful country in the heart of Europe. The blame of this inhuman transaction was attempted to be thrown upon the marquis de Louvois, one of his ministers. But Louis himself, whom history so incorrectly and unwisely styles the Great, was the criminal. "He signed the order," says Voltaire, "at his palace of Versailles, *because he saw nothing in such a command, except his power and the unhappy right of war.*"* And thus it is. Rulers little think, in the midst of their abundance gathered up from the spoils of the people, and surrounded in their palaces by the allurements of festivals and song, how many hearts of the poor, by such a mere dash of the pen, they have broken; how many peasants' cottages they have made forever desolate!

* Voltaire's Age of Louis XIV. chap. xv. See also Louis XV. chap. xxxv.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

OF WAR AS EXAMINED BY THE LIGHT OF NATURE.

We have thought it a matter of some consequence to attempt, in the preceding chapters, to give some idea (a very imperfect one, we are aware) of the evils of war. If the statements which have been made can lay no just claims to novelty, they may yet, perhaps, have power to refresh the memory, and to bring before the imagination pictures which had begun to fade away. In view of the evils of war, the inexpressible calamities to individuals and communities which ever attend it, we may earnestly appeal both to the humanity and the interests of mankind. If they have any kindly and generous feelings remaining, any emotions of pity, any compassion for their fellow-men, any bonds of brotherhood, let them at length listen to the suggestions of this amiable and ennobling part of our nature, and cease to practise those arts of destruction, which for six thousand years have deluged the earth with tears and blood. Or if, hardened against the kindly and sympathetic sensibilities, they consult merely the considerations of interest, we still take courage to entreat them to look upon their ruined habitations and wasted fields, and to learn war no more.

But there is a still higher part in man's nature. We do not feel at liberty to stop short with an appeal to men's sympathies, or to those views of an interested or prudential kind, which they may entertain; but, entering into that more elevated portion of the soul, which may be characterized as the sanctuary of DUTY, we put the question to their conscience and their re-

ligion. We ask them whether, as moral and religious beings, as beings subject to the regulation of the two-fold law of nature and of revelation, they have the RIGHT to destroy each other. Accordingly this is the distinct and important inquiry, upon the discussion of which we now propose to enter,—not whether war is consistent with the dictates of humanity, or the claims of common prudence and interest, but whether it is RIGHT, whether we can engage in war without SIN, in any case whatever?

We say, *in any case whatever*, because we do not propose to make any distinction between offensive and defensive war. If it can be proved that *defensive* wars are allowable, it would be altogether useless to pursue the inquiry any further, because, under the name and pretext of defensive war, national contests of every description would be carried on. Every belligerent nation, with scarcely a single exception, scornfully rejects the imputation of being the original aggressor, and professes to prosecute its warlike measures for purposes of self-protection. And so long as we admit that defensive wars are allowable on Christian principles, so long we grant, for all practical purposes, every thing which the advocates of war wish. The true doctrine is, that human life, both in its individual and corporate state, as one and as many, is INVIOLABLE; that it cannot be taken away for any purpose whatever, except by explicit divine permission; and that war, in every shape, and for every purpose, is *wrong*, absolutely *wrong*, wholly *wrong*. Any doctrine short of this will fall altogether powerless and useless upon the broad surface of the world's crimes and miseries; it will dim the light of no sword; it will wipe the tear of no widow and orphan.

The question of the right of war, including in the term *defensive* as well as *offensive war*, may be examined in a threefold point of view: (1.) by the light of nature; (2.) by the principles of the Old Testament;

(3.) by the principles of the gospel. This is the course, in the examination of this subject, which is taken by Grotius in the first book of his Law of Nations; a method of reasoning upon it which is at once simple and satisfactory. Our first inquiry, therefore, is, whether war, in any of its forms, is permitted by the light of nature.

The light of nature is nothing more nor less than the light of natural reason and conscience. But as the light of nature is understood to embrace in its influence all mankind, and of course to be accessible to the perceptions and convictions of all, the common view, which is taken of it, is, that the doctrines which it developes and establishes are easily perceived, are almost *intuitive;* that the preparative steps of reasoning are few, conviction being flashed upon the mind at once. Accordingly, if any one will take the trouble to inquire, he will find that writers on natural law (a portion of law which is understood to rest, not upon enactments, treaties, or conventions, but upon *nature*) seldom introduce long and abstruse trains of reasoning. On the contrary, the propositions which they lay down, involving, as they often do, immense consequences, are generally sustained by a plain and frank appeal to the intuitive common sense and common feeling of mankind. In the dispensation of the elements, the leading principles, of moral duty, nature has made no distinctions, has constituted no aristocracy; but has showered them down upon the learned and the unlearned, much as the rains are said to descend, without regard to character, upon the just and the unjust. To determine right and wrong, is of more consequence than to comprehend the doctrine of the planetary system; but while it required, in order to unfold the wonderful laws of the planets, the gigantic intellect of Newton, the higher gift of the determination of right and wrong is bestowed upon the simplest peasant, upon the man who cannot repeat the enu-

meration table. To determine, therefore, whether a thing is agreeable or not to the light of nature, all we have to do is, to determine whether it is agreeable to the common sense and common feeling of mankind. The prevalent sentiment of mankind, even if it should be interrupted and broken by a few discordant voices, will not be likely to be an erroneous one.

Let us, then, take the simplest case. Is it right, merely for our own gratification, to put a man to death, who has not injured us personally, nor done injury to the community? No one will pretend that, on such a question, there is need of labored argument; the decision is made at once, promptly, intuitively, and unanimously. Again: Is it right to put a man to death, who has merely committed an offence against property, the crime of theft? The reply, notwithstanding the strange practice of some nations, is equally prompt and decided. Furthermore: Is it right to put a man to death for some assault upon and injury to our person, which does not go so far as to affect life? In all these cases, the answer, resulting from the common perception and the common feeling of mankind, cannot be mistaken. We have here, not, indeed, the light of a long, deductive and demonstrative process, but what we may properly term the light of nature. On questions of this kind the ignorant man pronounces his opinions as promptly and decisively as the philosopher. It is his *nature* which speaks. If he is asked to give the reason why a man should not be put to death for nothing, or for theft, or for a blow upon his person, his answer is, that he has no reason to give, except that such is his conviction, founded upon the instinctive suggestions of his nature. It is his nature which controls his conviction; there is something deeply abhorrent to his natural and moral sensibilities in the shedding of blood; there is a voice within him, coming up from the sacred depths of the conscience, which pronounces it wrong. Kind-

ness, benevolence, abhorrence of the shedding of blood, is an attribute of humanity. So fully are we persuaded of this, that we cannot deny, that we have no great respect for the sensibilities of that man, who can look upon the butchery of a lamb, or of any dumb animal, with feelings of perfect indifference. How much analogy is there between the feelings of such a man and the benevolence of that God who hears the ravens when they cry, who gives their meat to the young lions, and without whose notice not even a sparrow falls to the ground? But when we see the knife applied to the throat of a human being, or the guillotine suspended over him, or the bayonet plunged into his breast, the remonstrances of nature are loud and overwhelming; and the man who can be indifferent there, who feels at such a time no instinctive oppositions of heart and conscience, has but little claim to be regarded or treated as a man.

But there are, perhaps, other cases, which are attended with more difficulty. We will suppose that an individual attacks us with dangerous weapons, and with an *evident intention to kill*, and that at the same time we are not in a situation to make our escape. Shall we not in that case defend ourselves? To this question we may answer in general terms, that, reasoning, as we now do, from the light of nature, undoubtedly we may. Not only the prompt decisions of reasoning and the dictates of conscience would permit us to make such defence, but we are also strengthened in our opinion of the propriety and rectitude of such a course by the consideration that we have within us, naturally, the principle of RESENTMENT. This principle, like all the other principles, coming under the general head of the natural sensibilities, has a twofold operation. It operates, in the first place, instinctively. When children, for example, are accidentally hit by a stone, or a savage by an arrow, they feel a momentary, instinctive rage against the inanimate object, and

smite it or break it to pieces. And it cannot be doubted that our Maker exhibits his beneficence in giving this instinctive form of operation to this principle. It is the object and the result of instinctive resentment to place us suddenly on our guard, and in the attitude of self-defence, against unforeseen and unexpected attacks. It operates in those cases where, if we were obliged to wait for the more tardy results of reasoning, we should infallibly suffer. There is another operation of resentment, distinct from its instinctive operation, which Mr. Stewart properly calls DELIBERATE. It appears more slowly; always implies the exercise of the reasoning power; and is more permanent than instinctive resentment. But, in both its forms, it seems to be an original principle, and is understood to be implanted for necessary and beneficent purposes. Now, with such a mental constitution, we cannot suppose, when left to the mere instructions of the light of nature, that we are prohibited from defending ourselves when thus attacked.

But the question, yet more difficult, arises here, whether, in acting on the principle of self-defence, we may not only repel our adversary, disarm him, disable him, and confine him, but whether we may also take his life. And here we may assert, without hesitation, (and are sustained in the opinion by some of the illustrious names of unchristianized antiquity,) that the light of nature authorizes us to go, in our efforts at self-defence, to the mere line of present and future protection, and no farther, except it be for the good of the aggressor himself. The principle of resentment is a protective, and not an aggressive, principle; it was designed to preserve ourselves, and not to bring suffering on others. Such is the original constitution of the human mind, that, in its unbiased and just action, it condemns and proscribes, decisively and forever, all retaliatory and revengeful feelings. In all cases, therefore, where we can preserve our own

life, without the extinction of that of our adversary's, we are bound, on the basis of enlightened conscience and reason, to preserve *both*. We come, then, to an ultimate case. We will suppose ourselves unable to disarm our adversary, and that we are morally certain, if we do not take his life, he will take ours. Here, we suppose, although some minds would be slow in coming to the conclusion, that mankind generally, unaided and unenlightened by revelation, would claim the right of putting to death their antagonist. And, on this basis, reasoning from individuals to nations, the light of nature would seem to authorize war in those extreme cases where we are obliged to choose between our own destruction and that of our assailant.

So far as this, arguing the subject from the light of nature alone, we feel disposed to concede to the advocates of war. We do not deny that, if the code of nature were the only code which binds its requisitions on the human race, the prospect of universal and permanent peace would be altogether a hopeless one. But we would beseech the advocates of the right of war not to forget, as seems to be too often done in arguing on this subject, that we are not left in this situation. It is not true, (and we ought to be grateful that we are permitted to say it,) that we are left to the guidance of the light of nature alone. In the present erring and fallen condition of the human race, every candid mind will be ready to confess that the light of nature is often dim and uncertain; and just so far as we have the purer and brighter radiance of revelation, we are under obligations to follow it.

CHAPTER NINTH.

OF WAR AS EXAMINED BY THE OLD TESTAMENT.

If we examine the subject of war as it appears in the light of nature, we may, perhaps, be obliged to admit that, in some extreme cases, which very seldom occur, it is allowable. But, in addition to the light of nature, as we have already had occasion to say, we have the purer and brighter light of revelation. The mere fact of a revelation from God implies that those unaided suggestions of natural reason and conscience, which are indicated by the phrase *light of nature*, are not enough for us in the actual circumstances of our situation. Accordingly, we naturally anticipate that there will be found, in the Scriptures, principles and practical requisitions, different from, and above, the principles and requisitions of nature. Revelation embraces the natural divisions of the Old and New Testaments, which are so clearly separated from each other by time, by events, and by principles, that there is no danger, in the examination of the subject before us, of their being confounded together. We proceed, therefore, to the examination of the subject of war, as it is presented to us in the Old Testament.

In the first place, we admit that wars were frequently carried on during those periods to which the Old Testament particularly relates, and that religious men, such as Abraham, Joshua, and David, participated in them. There is no question as to the fact. The question is in respect to the principle. On what grounds did this happen? What were the reasons which led to this state of things? We can-

not doubt that the wars of the Old Testament, so far as they were entered into and conducted by pious men, were understood by them to be fully authorized by the permission of God, either express or implied. It will be recollected that, during the long period of the Old Testament dispensations, God was in the habit of holding communications with his chosen people. Their government, even so far back as the time of Noah, may properly be denominated theocratical. In other words, God was their civil and political, as well as moral, governor. By dreams and visions of the night, by symbolic appearances, by the mouth of his prophets, by Urim and Thummim, and by the agency of angels, he condescended to make manifestations of his will to his people and their rulers. The subjects of those communications were more or less important: some of them have been handed down to us; but some, in all probability, have not been made matter of historical record. But certainly it would be unreasonable to suppose that the subject of the destruction of human life and of war was wholly passed by. If we had no express testimony to the fact, we should certainly conclude, from the nature of the case, that the pious servants of Jehovah would not feel at liberty to destroy their fellow-men, without a knowledge of the divine will in so important a matter. They consulted him in other things; they were in the habit of regulating their conduct by his directions and advice; and is it at all probable, that, in so responsible business as that of shedding human blood, they would either refuse to seek his counsel, or would disregard it when given?

The first war particularly mentioned in the Bible, as having been carried on by those whose example would have any weight in this discussion, is that which was commenced by Abraham for the rescue of Lot. In regard to this case, we admit it does not

appear, from the record which we have of those events, that any divine permission was expressly given to Abraham. And yet, from a knowledge of his character, and, particularly, of his entire reliance upon God, we are naturally led to conclude, that, if he had not an express revelation on the subject, he yet had such evidences and intimations in regard to it, as, according to the best views he could take, justified him in the course he pursued. His reply to the proposition of the king of Sodom, that he had lifted up his hand unto the Lord, the most high God, &c., seems to indicate very clearly, that he had not engaged in this warlike enterprise for mere worldly purposes, nor without a reference to the will of that great Being in whom he believed; especially when we consider that he was blessed for his conduct by Melchisedek, the priest of the most high God; and that, both before and after this event, he had direct communications with God himself. If we examine the wars which took place in the times of Moses and Joshua, we shall find more decisive evidence that they were commenced and carried on, as a general thing, under the divine direction. On a certain occasion, the Israelites proposed to make an attack upon the Amalekites; but what was the language of Moses? "Go not up, *for the Lord is not among you;* that ye be not smitten before your enemies." In another case, it is said, when Arad the Canaanite opposed the passage of the Israelites through his territories, that "Israel vowed a vow unto the Lord, and said, If thou wilt indeed deliver this people into my hand, then I will utterly destroy their cities. And the Lord hearkened to the voice of Israel, and delivered up the Canaanites." When the king of Bashan came out against the Israelites to give battle at Edrei, "The Lord said unto Moses, Fear him not, for I have delivered him into thy hand, and all his people, and his land." The wars which were waged,

after the death of Moses, under the direction of Joshua, were commenced and carried on with the divine permission and approbation. After directing him to arise and pass over the Jordan, God says to Joshua, "Every place that the sole of your foot shall tread upon, that have I given unto you, as I said unto Moses. From the wilderness and this Lebanon even unto the great river, the river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites." In other instances, too numerous to repeat here, we find that God kept in his own hands the direction in this matter; and that nearly in proportion as his people revered him, and loved him, and were disposed to do his pleasure, they consulted him in all measures of a warlike nature. This, at least, is found to be so frequently the case, that, in those instances where no record of such consultation has come down to us, we may reasonably infer that it was not in fact omitted. And this is what we should naturally expect from a consideration of the immense consequences involved in war; and particularly after the solemn announcement on Mount Sinai, THOU SHALT NOT KILL.

The sixth commandment furnishes a key to the interpretation of the whole of the Old Testament on the subject of the inviolability of human life. By keeping this key in our hand, we may unlock it, and explain it in entire consistency with itself, from beginning to end; and in consistency also with the New Testament. We have no idea that this command, *Thou shalt not kill*, was limited, as some imagine, to cases of manslaughter and murder. We are aware that some distinguished names would impose this limitation. Even Rosenmueller translates it by the Latin expressions, NE HOMICIDIUM COMMITTITE; thus limiting the prohibition to the crime of murder in its various forms. But, we venture to assert, it will not be maintained by biblical critics, that this limitation of meaning is found in the verb itself,

which is unquestionably one of the most general import. The meaning of the passage, taken by itself, is simply this: Thou shalt not take life; life is sacred, inviolable. Nor does any thing in the *connection*, so far as we can perceive, suggest any such limitation as has been contended for. The true connection and relations of the passage are to be found in the chapter in which it is contained. There is a clear line of distinction both between what goes before and what comes after; and, in this chapter, it is undeniable that no limitation of the terms in question is either made, or even suggested, excepting we may infer from the general objects, and manner of the communications made at this time, that the prohibition refers to the taking of human life, and not to that of brute animals.

It is not denied that a portion of the Jewish civil code was communicated at the same time, or nearly at the same, with the announcement of the tables of the moral law; and that in this code the punishment of death is required to be inflicted in certain cases. But what precise time elapsed, and what explanatory or other communications took place between the announcement of the moral and civil code, we have now no means of knowing. We may reasonably suppose, however, that enough was communicated to the Jews to remove from the course of divine proceeding all inconsistency and obscurity. God, it may be supposed, gave his people to understand that the prohibition of the sixth commandment was binding upon *men*, to whom it was directed, and not upon *himself*; that no man was at liberty to destroy the life which he could not give; and that, consequently, it could not be taken, in any case whatever, without his express permission. And accordingly we find him, in his capacity of civil and political ruler, granting this permission to some extent; not because it was so in the beginning, not because he designed it

to be so in the end, but undoubtedly for the reason applicable in the case of polygamy and divorce, viz., on account of the hardness of their hearts, and their sins.

The prohibition, therefore, contained in the sixth commandment, stands out in all its distinctness and solemnity, sanctioned by all the impressive circumstances which attended God's appearance on Mount Sinai, and to be obeyed in all situations whatever, except where God, by a special interposition, is pleased to suspend it. As God is the author of life, we naturally feel that no one besides himself has a right to take it away, with the single exception which was mentioned in the last chapter, viz., where our own life comes in direct and certain conflict with that of another; and even in that case no one pretends to deny that it is his right, when he sees fit to exercise it, to determine who shall fall. His command possesses the prerogative of overruling even our natural feelings of resentment. Whatever may be true on the subject of taking human life when we are left to the light of nature, it is certain that God, when he undertakes to reveal his will, and to legislate in addition to, and in completion of, the light of nature, may lay down such regulations in regard to the inviolability of life as he sees fit. He has said, THOU SHALT NOT KILL; he has made use of the most general terms, clearly asserting the inviolability of human life in all cases whatever; he has promulgated this command in the most solemn manner; he has incorporated it into the specific and glorious code of the ten commandments, which alone, amid the wreck of ceremonial and political regulations, is sanctioned and established forever by the Mediator of the new covenant.

This, therefore, is the conclusion at which we arrive on this part of our subject. In the periods of the Old Testament, life was taken, and wars were carried

on, by those who are represented in the Epistle to the Hebrews as having lived and died in the faith, not on the ground of *natural right*, (for they were now placed under a theocracy or economy above that of the light of nature,) but on the ground of *permission*. God, as the great arbiter of life and death, had once, in his righteous anger, drowned the whole world; had sent down fire and consumed the corrupt cities of Sodom and Gomorrah; had opened the earth and swallowed up Korah and his company; and, in repeated instances, he smote and destroyed his own people and their enemies with some deadly disease; but he saw fit, for wise reasons, which we are not at liberty to gainsay, to employ war as the more common instrument of his indignation. When he saw a nation occupying lands belonging to another, as was the case with the Canaanites in their occupancy of Palestine; when he saw them unjustly attempting to destroy his own beloved people; when he beheld them given up to every species of idolatry and moral corruption, — he determined to secure the great ends of justice and beneficence by destroying them in war. It is true, he might have effected his object by other means, but he chose this. If his people, in some instances, either in their forgetfulness or their sin, seized the sword and took life without his permission, we find that they did not always escape his rebukes and chastisements; and certainly this unauthorized and sinful conduct is no suitable precedent and authority for us.

But it is worthy of particular notice, that, while the taking of life and the practice of war were permitted, during the periods of the Old Testament dispensations, we have repeated intimations, in the Old Testament itself, of a better state of things; of a day when war and its attendant miseries shall cease. The ceremonial institutions and rites seem to have

had a meaning prefigurative of that better, purer, and more peaceful state. Even the tabernacle and the temple had their spiritual import. And it is worthy of remark, that David, with all his success and glory, was not permitted to build the temple, because "*he had shed blood abundantly, and made great wars.*" This certainly looks as if the shedding of blood was not a thing pleasant in the sight of God, but was permitted, in the wisdom and supremacy of his providence, in consequence of the peculiar situation of mankind. But there are express predictions on this subject. It is not necessary to repeat all the passages which are now referred to; a few will afford ample matter for profound reflection. Isa. ii. 3, 4: "And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; *and shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.*" And again, in the same prophet, chap. ix. 6, 7: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, *the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end.*" And again, chap. xi. 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9: "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the

fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like an ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den. *They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.*" See also the prophet Micah, iv. 1—5.

In view of these passages, and others of a like import, it cannot be doubted that we are fully authorized to anticipate the actual existence of a day, whether it shall be slow or rapid in its advent, when wars shall cease, when contentions shall exist no longer. The day of aggression and of retaliation will certainly come to an end. But can this universal diffusion of harmony consist with the principle that it is right and justifiable to do acts of injury and violence? What sort of a millennium would the bright period referred to prove to be, if every actual or supposed injury might, without impropriety, call forth other acts of violence in repelling them, or in retaliation of them? Who has ever associated, in his conceptions of the serenity, quietude, and love of the millennial period, the recognition, either practical or theoretical, of the belligerent dogma, "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth"? It seems, from the very nature of the case, that the principle of non-resistance, based upon emotions of true and heart-felt love, must be the forerunner, the attendant, and the grand security, of that blessed state of the world.

So that while Jehovah, in the exercise of that the ocratical sovereignty, of which we have the particular account in the Old Testament, permitted wars in the existing state of things, he at the same time teaches his prophets to inform us by the peculiar methods of

prophetical communication, that this is only the temporary, and not the permanent, feature of his administration; that war shall ultimately cease; that the great doctrine, THOU SHALT NOT KILL, shall at last gain a practical ascendency; and that human life, with the exception of his own authority over it, shall stand, in all the possible circumstances of its earthly existence, inviolable and sacred.

CHAPTER TENTH.

OF WAR AS EXAMINED BY THE PRINCIPLES OF THE GOSPEL.

If we examine the subject of war by the light of NATURE alone, unaided by any thing in the form of a divine communication, we are not disposed to deny that men may, in a few extreme cases, justly carry on war. So far as this, for the reasons already given, we concede to those who differ from us on this great subject. If, in accordance with the plan laid down, we proceed to examine the subject in the light of the Old Testament, we maintain (taking the acknowledged ground that God's chosen people were from the beginning under a theocracy more or less fully developed) that human life is held inviolable, and that this great principle cannot be suspended, except by God himself, the author of life. And if we can, at the present day, make ourselves sure of an express divine permission to take life, as Moses and Joshua, and other Old Testament saints, did, we are undoubtedly at liberty to take it. But we are to keep in view, in this part of our inquiry, that the Old Testament itself holds out the prospect of a different and better state of things — a day when blood shall no longer flow, when conflicts and wars shall cease.

But, having passed upward from the ground of nature to the ground of the Old Testament, we are now prepared to take a step higher, and to place our feet upon the plain of Bethlehem, beside the cradle of the great Christian Legislator, with an illuminated sky above us, and hosts of angels uttering, in strains unknown before, PEACE ON EARTH, GOOD WILL TO

MEN. It is in the New Testament, and under the Christian dispensation, of which Jesus Christ is eminently and emphatically the author, that we must settle permanently this interesting question.

Before attempting to show from the New Testament, that war, in no shape whatever, is allowable, it may be of some importance to premise that, in making this attempt, we labor under great disadvantages. We cannot reasonably expect an entirely candid hearing. Even those who imagine that they may be fully prepared to receive the truth on this subject, may nevertheless be under the influence of some secret and imperceptible bias. The truth is, the natural and unholy feelings of mankind are against us. If a man is greatly injured, he has a natural feeling, a sort of instinctive impulse, that it is right for him to defend himself, and, under certain circumstances and to a certain extent, to attack, to retaliate, to charge home, to carry the war into the enemy's territory. And accordingly, when our doctrine of the entire inviolability of human life, in all cases whatever, is proposed to him, he instinctively sets himself against it; and it is a hundred to one that he is not in a proper situation to listen attentively and candidly to the arguments by which it is supported. We mention this unfavorable state of things, in order that the inquirer into the truth of our doctrine may scrutinize his own feelings, and may use all suitable efforts to put himself in a situation where every well-founded consideration will have its due effect. And we may add, further, that it is highly important, and a *duty*, that he should take this course. And unless he does, and does it, too, in the full purpose and sincerity of his heart, we frankly acknowledge we have no hope of a favorable issue.

Our present argument addresses itself, it will be perceived, not to the Atheist, who believes in no God, nor to the Deist, who rejects the Divine Word; nor

to the mere Moralist, who weaves from the elements of his imperfect reason the web of a spurious and unsound philosophy; nor to the mere speculative believer, who gives a nominal assent to the gospel, without imbibing or recognizing its spirit; but to the real, the devoted, the humble *Christian;* to him who makes Christ his great example, and truly desires to be animated by the same spirit of sublime charity, benevolence, and forgiveness, which glowed so brightly in the bosom of the Savior. And here we entreat the inquirer on this subject to put the question to himself — Do I in fact receive, and am I truly willing to receive, the gospel in my heart? Am I willing that the spirit which reigned in Christ, whatever it may be, and however humbling in the estimation of the world, may reign in my own bosom? Am I truly of that pure, meek, quiet, benevolent temper, which is appropriate to the Christian character, and of which the Savior, whom I profess to follow, furnishes so illustrious an example? It cannot be doubted that every thing depends upon the answer which shall be given to these questions. It is a great truth, which cannot be too often and seriously insisted upon, that the church, that the professed followers of Christ, must take the lead on this subject; must investigate it, and form an opinion on it *first.* While Christians are careless, and stupid, and hesitating, in this great business, it is a matter of course that the unbelieving world, carried away by its unholy passions, and subject to its ten thousand lusts, will scoff at the doctrine of the inviolability of life and the unlawfulness of war. Let every Christian consider well how he judges in this matter; let him come to the investigation with an humble heart, with true meekness of disposition. If Christians come to this inquiry in the spirit of war, it will not be surprising if they imagine they find war; if they come in the spirit of peace, they will undoubtedly find

peace; and as Christians go, the world, the *whole* world, will, either sooner or later, go with them.

In proceeding now to examine the subject of war in the light of the New Testament, we remark, in the FIRST place, that war, in all its forms, is opposed by those numerous passages which require men to love their fellow men. — Matt. xxii. 37, 8, 9: "Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, — Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The Savior himself, in the parable of the good Samaritan, has explained whom we are to understand by our neighbor. The commentary of the Savior authorizes us to understand the term as including all mankind, every class and condition of men; however they may be separated from us by difference of language, by distance of country, by diversities of opinion, religion, customs, government, and political interests; however they be, from some unpropitious circumstances, arrayed even in actual or supposed hostility. There is not, even under these circumstances, a release from the law of love. The remarks of the apostle on this subject, in the 13th of Romans, are of kindred import: "Owe no man any thing but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, &c., is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." And again, in the 13th chapter of First Corinthians: "Charity suffereth long and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up; doth not behave itself unseemly; *seeketh not her own; is not easily provoked; thinketh no evil; beareth all things, be-*

lieveth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things."

It must be admitted that these pacific principles are but too little accordant with the common feelings and practice of mankind. If one man reviles another, or takes his property, or injures him in his person, we may certainly expect to see decided indications of anger and retaliation. But are not such feelings and conduct inconsistent with the passages which have been quoted? Is he who returns anger for anger, smiting for smiting, blow for blow, justly to be regarded as imbued with the spirit of that heaven-born love, which seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, suffereth long, beareth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things?

In the SECOND place, the pugnacious and retaliatory spirit — in other words, the spirit of war, for whatever object it may be carried on — is rebuked by those numerous passages, in which a peaceful deportment is commended, and in which the duties of peace are urged upon the early Christians. Let the reader observe carefully, and with a sincere desire to imbibe their true spirit, the expressions of our Savior in his sermon on the mount: — "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God." — "Have peace one with another." Mark ix. 50. "But the fruit of the Spirit is *love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness,* faith, *meekness,* temperance." Gal. v. 22, 23. "Follow peace with all men." Heb. xii. 14. "But the wisdom that is from above, is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace." James iii. 17, 18. "Finally, breth-

ren, farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you." 2 Cor. xiii. 11. — Now, let it be considered what course we are to pursue, and what spirit we are required to cherish in these passages. We are to be poor in spirit, to be meek, merciful, peaceable, long-suffering, gentle, and easy to be entreated. And can we seriously and candidly reflect upon the real import of such expressions, without admitting that they are altogether at variance with that temper of mind which would prompt to acts of violence and hostility even in what we might be disposed to consider a just cause? If we were to hear of some distant individual possessing the traits indicated by these expressions, — if he were described to us as a man of great humility and meekness of spirit, as a peace-maker, as merciful, gentle, and long-suffering, — we certainly should receive the impression, that he would not be disposed to resort to acts of hostility, even if injurious and uncalled-for attacks had been actually made upon him.

It is to be noticed, in the THIRD place, there is another class of passages, in their import nearly identical, though opposite in expression from those which have just been brought forward, viz., those which reprove and condemn a spirit of contention and strife. — "Who will render to every man according to his deeds; unto them that are *contentious*, &c., tribulation and anguish." Rom. ii. 6—9. "Let us walk honestly as in the day, not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, *not in strife and envying*." Rom. xiii. 13. "Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem others better than themselves." Phil. ii. 3. "But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and be not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. For where envying and strife is,

there is confusion and every evil work." James iii. 14, 15, 16.—It may, perhaps, be said here, that, in the act of self-defence, we may attack, smite, and injure another, and at the same time be under the influence of truly pacific and benevolent feelings, rather than those of a different character. We do not absolutely deny the possibility of this; but we assert without hesitation that it is seldom the case. Writers on the philosophy of the mind (among others, Mr. Stewart, who is exceedingly cautious in the expression of his opinions) give us to understand, that human nature is so constituted as to involve, as one of its fundamental laws, a correspondence between the outward sign and the inward emotion. If there is anger within, there is naturally a correspondent expression in the gesture, voice, eye, countenance. And on the other hand, any violent action, or violent and agitated expression of the countenance, naturally calls up an unpleasant and violent feeling within; so that, if a person uses violence, and enters into strife, on any occasion whatever, he may calculate upon it as something but little short of certainty, that he will have the spirit of strife; so that the direction, requiring us not to contend and strive, even when we are injured, is wonderfully adapted to the structure of the human mind, and undoubtedly operates to the good of the individual, on whom it seems, at the first sight, to impose a disadvantageous restriction.

Under this head, it is proper to observe that, in the New Testament, we have some practical examples, some instances in real life, illustrating the manner in which the Savior designed that the peace-principles should be applied. On a certain time, the Savior proposed, with his disciples, to enter a city of the Samaritans; but they refused to receive him. Luke ix. 54, 55: "And when his disciples, James and John, saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them, even

as Elias did? But he turned, *and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.*" —And, again, we have a practical illustration of the peace principles in Matt. xxvi. 51, 52: "And, behold, one of them which were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest, and smote off his ear. Then said Jesus unto him, *Put up again thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.*"

FOURTHLY. Wars of every description are rebuked, discountenanced, and condemned by that numerous class of passages of Scripture which enjoin forbearance and patience under the trials and sufferings of life.—If we may meet evil with evil, and return blow for blow, where is the propriety or pertinency of such passages as the following? Luke xxi. 17—19: "And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake. But there shall not a hair of your head perish. *In your patience possess ye your souls.*" The apostle Paul prayed to God for the Colossians, that they might be "strengthened with all might, according to his glorious power, *unto all patience and long-suffering with joyfulness.*" What can be more striking or pertinent to the matter in hand than the following explicit passage? 1 Peter ii. 19—23: "For this is thankworthy, if a man, for conscience toward God, endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? *But if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. For even hereunto were you called;* because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps; who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not, but committed himself to Him that judgeth righteously." It is not necessary to repeat

other passages of the same import, nor do they require any comment. Their spirit is too express and obvious to be mistaken.

FIFTH. Those passages which assert a change and renovation of our natures, obviously imply the subjection or eradication of those principles which are of a hostile and retaliatory tendency. — 2 Cor. v. 17: "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." It appears obviously from the following passages, that one of the elements of the new life, one of the characteristics of the new creature just spoken of, is a quiet and pacific disposition. 1 Cor. iii. 3: "For ye are yet carnal; for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and division, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?" Gal. v. 19—22: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, &c., — hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, sedition, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like; of the which I tell you before, as I have told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith." James iv. 1: "From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your own members?" It is obvious from these passages and others like them, that the spirit of violence and strife (no matter on what occasion it may be called forth) is an element of the old man, whom we are required to put off, with his deeds, and that a truly pacific disposition is an element of the new man, an indispensable characteristic of a state of regeneracy.

Let us, in the SIXTH place, set before us the example of our blessed Savior, and see what that will teach us. — We presume it is not necessary to go into details, in order to show what this example is. The

Savior came into the world on an errand of mercy; from his early childhood, he went about doing good; he every where, at all times, and in all places, exhibited the most tender compassion and benevolence; he healed the sick, unstopped the ears of the deaf, restored the sight of the blind, raised the dead; when reviled, he reviled not again; but in every situation, and under the greatest insults and injuries, he exhibited the most wonderful patience, meekness, and love. When hurried by the infuriated multitude to the brow of a precipice, he took no other measures of resistance or of retribution, but simply to escape from them. When the disciples were disposed to employ violent measures in his defence, he disapproved of the course they proposed to take. He told Peter to put up his sword into his sheath, and healed the servant of the high priest, whom that disciple had wounded. When Pilate reproached him with being delivered up by the people and priests of his own nation, he answered in these remarkable and decisive words, which ought to be deeply engraven on every one's memory: "*My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence.*" Amid all the agonies of the garden and the cross, he exhibited no disposition to complain against his enemies. His language was, (in strict accordance with his own divine precepts,) "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Now, we are told that Christ is set before us to be our example; we are required to walk in his footsteps; we are directed to consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, who endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest we be wearied and faint in our minds. And how a man, who truly takes Christ for his example, can engage in war of any kind whatever, is more than we can understand. It is impossible.

SEVENTH. If it is necessary to say any thing further, in order to convince the humble and candid inquirer of the unlawfulness and iniquity of all wars, we may introduce also, as still more decisive than those already brought forward, the numerous passages which require forgiveness of injuries, and the love of our enemies. — We request the particular attention of the reader to the three following passages: — Coloss. iii. 12, 13: "Put on, therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering, forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye." Romans xii. 19, 20, 21: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome with evil, but overcome evil with good." Matt. v. 38—46: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away. Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on

the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye?"

Eighth. It might, perhaps, be objected to the numerous passages which have been brought forward, that they do not *directly* condemn and forbid war, but only condemn and forbid those dispositions which lead to war, and require those of an opposite kind. But this objection will have but little weight, when it is considered that it is an obvious dictate of common sense, that, if the means, which are absolutely requisite to a particular end, are condemned and forbidden, the end itself is forbidden. Now, we are required to be meek, patient, forgiving, not to avenge ourselves, and to love our enemies; and, if these dispositions are obviously and absolutely inconsistent with war, as they undeniably are, then war is just as much forbidden, as if it were said so in the most express and the fewest terms possible. The objection has not the least weight.

But this is not all. We may take the higher ground, that war is not only indirectly, but directly forbidden. The express commands to love our enemies, not to avenge ourselves, when smitten on the one cheek to turn the other, and to recompense to no man evil for evil, are not, on any fair construction of them, to be regarded as commands merely indirectly and remotely prohibitory of war; they are direct and positive prohibitions; they lay the axe at the root; they prohibit, as decisively and positively as any thing can, all acts of retaliation and violence. But there is one command more, which will perhaps come nearer to the popular notion of a direct and positive prohibition. It is, *Thou shalt not kill.* Something has already been said in relation to this commandment; and we shall not take occasion to remark more fully upon it. All we have to say now is, that this command was first given in the tables of the moral law,

and given, too, without limitation. It expresses the absolute inviolability of human life, subject only to the permission and control of the Supreme Being. That, God, acting as the civil ruler of the Jews, subsequently gave permission to take life in certain cases, and to carry on war for certain purposes, is not denied. But it will be recollected that this command is reënacted and solemnly confirmed in the New Testament, by the Savior himself, *without any exception whatever*. Matt. v. 21: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, *Thou shalt not kill;* and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire." Now, the exceptions in the Old Testament to the great command of the decalogue, upon which we are remarking, are to be found in the political and civil code of the Jews. In respect to this code, no one doubts that it was designed to be temporary. At the coming of Christ, so far as it was a matter of divine enactment, and rested upon divine authority, it was wholly done away; and the original law of Mount Sinai, after it was recognized and confirmed by the Savior, took full effect. THOU SHALT NOT KILL, therefore, is binding upon all since the time of Christ; it is as obligatory upon the present, as upon any preceding generation; and in vain do we look in the New Testament for any suspension of its action, or any mitigation of its import.

Nor are these the only passages which may be regarded as express prohibitions. "Since the time," says the learned Erasmus, "that Jesus Christ said, Put up thy sword into its scabbard, Christians *ought not to go to war*." Christ suffered Peter to fall into an error in this matter, on purpose that, when he had

put up Peter's sword, it might remain no longer a doubt *that war was prohibited.*" * Nor is this all. The saying of the Savior to Pilate, that, "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight," is equivalent to saying that "My servants do not fight, because my kingdom is not a worldly kingdom." This passage is also a direct, and not merely an indirect, prohibition of war.

But there is one more passage, to which particular attention is requested. Heb. xii. 14: "*Follow peace with all men.*" It will be noticed, it is not said you must follow peace with your own countrymen, but may fight with a foreigner, — that you must be at peace with your friend, but may kill your enemy. No such thing as this. But you must follow peace with *all* men: you are not at liberty to make distinctions, and to say, "I will be at peace with one man, and will contend with another;" the command is as wide as the world; it embraces all classes of men; it requires us to be at peace with all, without any exception whatever. But, furthermore, there is something peculiar in this precept, as it stands in the original. The Greek verb is DIOKETE. It is the same that is used by the apostle Paul, where he speaks of *pressing* towards the mark. It expresses not only the doing of a thing, but doing it with zeal, with energy, with the whole power of heart and intellect. The expression is one that is commonly applied to the combatants, the runners, and charioteers, of the great Grecian games. What earnestness there is in their countenance! How every nerve and muscle is urged to the highest exercise! How they bend forward, as upon the wings of the wind! Life itself is nothing in comparison with the object before them. It is in this manner we are required to prac-

* As quoted in Dymond's Essays on the Principles of Morality.

tise peace; not to submit to it merely as a burden to be borne, but to seek it as an object of the greatest love; not to abandon it, because it will sometimes cost us inconvenience and expense, but to pursue it at every outlay of exertion, and at every hazard of life. The charioteers of Greece would joyfully have died, rather than have lost their object; and so we must die, lose any thing and every thing, rather than lose the triumphal crown of peace.

FINALLY. In addition to what has been said, we shall find a further and powerful argument in support of the doctrine, that all wars are prohibited by the precepts and spirit of the New Testament, *in the nature of prayer*. Prayer is a duty which our natural reason tells us we owe to the Supreme Being, and which we should be bound to perform, even if we were destitute of revelation. But, in the Scriptures, it is constantly enforced upon us. We are required, by the word of God, to pray always, — to perform all our intelligent and moral acts in the spirit of supplication. And we do not hesitate in the remark, that, to an enlightened and conscientious Christian, prayer may be made one of the most certain tests of the rectitude of the course which he proposes to take. If such a person cannot pray over what he proposes to do, — if he cannot ask God's blessing upon it, — he may safely come to the conclusion that there is something wrong in it. And it may be asked, therefore, with great emphasis and great meaning, What sort of a prayer could a soldier offer, when going into battle? We must remember, in answering this question, that his prayer must be offered, not in the spirit of the light of nature, — perhaps we may say, not in the spirit even of the Old Testament, — but in the spirit of the gospel. And what spirit does the gospel require us to exercise towards others, even those whom we correctly regard as our enemies? We have already seen. "Love your enemies. Do good

to them which hate you. Bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you. And ye shall be the children of the Highest; for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil. Be ye, therefore, merciful, as your Father is merciful. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink. Be not overcome with evil, but overcome evil with good."

God commands the soldier, as well as others, to do good to those who hate him, to love his enemies, to be merciful, not to avenge; but, in compliance with that great requisition, which is also binding upon him as well as upon others, — to pray, and to ask God's blessing on all we do, — he asks (or rather he hypocritically *professes* to ask) the divine blessing in smiting, piercing, maiming, striking to the earth, and sending into eternity, those whom he is expressly required to love, to feed, and to pray for. Can such a prayer be accepted? Can it be offered with the least sincerity by one who has any correct understanding of the New Testament? Will it not freeze and wither upon his lips?

It is not long since that we were looking over the life of the celebrated Suwarrow; and our attention was attracted by certain directions to soldiers, commonly known as *Suwarrow's Catechism*. It would be well for the advocates of war to compare this celebrated production, which has been a great favorite of the Russian armies, with the Savior's sermon on the mount. What the sermon on the mount is, every one knows; it breathes nothing but meekness, peace, and love. But what says the Catechism of Suwarrow? "Push hard with the bayonet. The ball will lose its way; the bayonet never. The ball is a fool; the bayonet a hero. Stab once, and off with the

Turk from the bayonet! Stab the second! stab the third! A hero will stab half a dozen! If three attack you, stab the first, fire on the second, and bayonet the third!" This is the spirit of war. These are the directions of a great warrior. And now, we ask again, can the spirit of humble, penitent, and benevolent supplication exist in connection with such a temper of mind as is indicated here?

In view of the considerations and the passages of Scripture which have been brought forward in this chapter, we put the serious inquiry, whether, as professed followers of Christ, — whether, as believers in that new and glorious gospel which he came to announce, — we are not to regard all wars as entirely prohibited, and as utterly wrong and sinful? We are aware it is easy to cavil; it is easy to make objections, where the path is as clear as meridian day; but we address ourselves now to those who truly take the gospel for their guide, and who, with an humble and prayerful spirit, are willing to go wherever it may lead. We have no doubt what answer they will give. Let them, then, speedily awake on this momentous subject. We fear that Christians have been sadly blinded, not only on the subject of war in general, but in respect to all acts of retaliation and violence. We entreat them to pause as one man, to take the Bible into their hands, (particularly the exalted and completed revelation of the New Testament,) and, examining it with the utmost care, to consider, with deep solicitude, where they have been going, and what they have been doing.

CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

OBJECTIONS DRAWN FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In the last chapter, it was made to appear, by a reference to the New Testament, that wars of every description are unlawful. We are aware, however, that some few things may be said, not altogether destitute of plausibility, by way of objection to what has been adduced. In the first place, it is objected that the precepts of the New Testament are of individual, and not of national application; that they relate to men, in their private, and not in their social and corporate capacity. We need not be at a loss for an answer, (and what we conceive to be an ample and satisfactory answer) to this objection. The answer is to be found in the arrangements and methods of reasoning adopted in those treatises which especially relate to the duties and intercourse of nations.

In all complete treatises on the law of nations, we find the distinction (undoubtedly insisted upon much more at length in some than in others) into the natural and conventional law. The natural law of nations is that portion of the law of nations which is founded in *nature;* by which is universally understood to be meant, that it is founded in the constitution or nature of man. In other words, the whole reasoning, running through this portion of the law of nations, is based upon this single principle, that, as nations are composed of individuals, whatever is right or wrong in individuals, is also right or wrong in nations, acting under similar circumstances. The natural reason and conscience of man, judging as to what is right or wrong in his own individual conduct, is the standard

which the writer on this portion of the law of nations constantly refers to, in attempting to prescribe the path of international action. But since the introduction of the gospel, men are placed under a new dispensation, superadded to, and far above, that of mere unaided nature. If there are some things which are permitted by the light of nature, but are forbidden by the gospel, no one can doubt that their conduct in their individual capacity is now to be regulated, not by the permission of nature, but by the prohibition of revelation. They are now placed on a higher position; not only more elevated than that formerly occupied by them, but enveloped in light; they are under a new law, infinitely transcending any of which the unaided human intellect is the source.

Now, what we claim is, the right to reason, and to apply principles of action, in the same way in which writers on the law of nations have always reasoned and applied principles of action. They have reasoned from individuals to nations, and have applied to nations principles of action which they claimed to be just and obligatory in the case of individuals. But if the law of individuals is altered, if God has seen fit to impart a light additional to the light of nature, thereby developing and requiring a course of conduct beyond and above what unaided nature would have indicated, — then we do only what has hitherto been done, and reason as men have hitherto reasoned, when we extend these higher principles of action, which are now acknowledged to be binding upon individuals, to those communities and nations which these individuals have formed by associating with each other. In other words, if the principles of the gospel are binding upon men in their individual, they are also binding upon them in their social, capacity.

Secondly. The following passage of Scripture, uttered by the Savior himself, is to be regarded, in the opinion of the opposers of the non-resistance doctrine,

as authorizing war. Luke xxii. 36: "Then said he unto them, But, now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip; *and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one.*" In regard to this passage, we admit that, if its import were not qualified by what took place, and was said, at the time of its being uttered, it would be favorable to the practice of war. It appears, from what is said in the connection, that the Savior meant this saying, and that he was understood by his disciples to mean it, as a direction for immediate action; as a requisition to array themselves against the onset of some danger near at hand. Accordingly they answered him, and said, "Behold, here are two swords." And what was the answer of the Savior? "*And he said unto them, It is enough.*" Now, it is to be noticed that there were eleven persons present besides Jesus; and they were directed, as they understood his words, to prepare for immediate warlike action. And what, then, could they make of his remark, that, when the danger was obviously urgent, and there were eleven men prepared to meet it, *two swords were enough.* Does this look like serious military preparation? Must not the disciples have considered the Savior a singular commander, who certainly meant to carry on his warfare on principles entirely different from those which were current in the world? In a word, does not the remark of the Savior, that two swords were enough, of itself intimate to us that he required his disciples to get swords, in order to give them, and with no other object whatever, a living, practical, and visible illustration of the use which his followers must make of their military arms, whenever they might happen to have them in possession? Soon afterwards, a great multitude came out against the Savior with swords and staves; and Peter, in the heat of his military zeal, made an attack upon the opposing party, and wounded the servant of the high priest. The Savior un-

doubtedly foresaw this result of his direction to his disciples to obtain swords, and he permitted it in order that he might, on the spot, and in the midst of bloodshed, the more strikingly and emphatically express to his disciples and to the world his abhorrence of all resort to violence; and that he most seriously intended that the pacific principles which he had formerly announced should be carried into practical effect, even under the most trying circumstances. Mark his language to Peter, as we find it recorded in the different evangelists, when he saw him using violence against the servant of the high priest. And Jesus answered and said, "Suffer ye thus far. Put up thy sword into the sheath. The cup which my Father hath given to me, shall I not drink it? All they which take the sword shall perish by the sword. And he touched his ear, [of the wounded servant,] and healed him."— We will not delay longer upon the passage which has given occasion to these remarks. Certain it is, if we take it in connection with what follows, it affords no encouragement to acts of violence. If it may seem to authorize us to *purchase* a sword, the remarks subsequently made by the Savior evidently require us to keep it in the sheath, or at least not to use it for belligerent purposes.

THIRDLY. It is further objected to the doctrine, that we are not permitted to engage in war of any kind, that John the Baptist did not condemn the employment of the soldiers who asked of him what they should do, but merely required of them a more upright and circumspect course of life in the discharge of the duties of that employment. Luke iii. 14: "And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages." In reply to this objection, we may remark, among other things, that the authority of John the Baptist, who at most had but a dim

and imperfect conception of the purity and exalted nature of that dispensation of which he was the forerunner, is of no account, when placed in opposition with the precepts of Christ. We are fully justified in this remark by what the Savior himself says of John the Baptist, Matt. xi. 11: "He that is least in the kingdom of heaven, is greater than he." — John the Baptist belonged, in many respects at least, to the preceding state of things; his moral system, although some glimmerings of the rising light broke in upon his mind, was that of the law; he spoke in the awful and denunciatory tone of the prophets, rather than in the forgiving and benignant utterance of the gospel. And if it be true that his directions to the soldiers seem to recognize their calling as a lawful one, we must still regard them as among those things which have now passed away.

And, furthermore, have we not a right to lay some stress upon those remarkable expressions, (remarkable, certainly, when addressed to soldiers,) *Do violence to no man.* Does it not seem (at least, we will hazard the conjecture) as if his mind was suspended and oscillating between the spirit of the two systems — that to which he himself belonged, and which he knew was passing away, and that which was, in the dim distance, coming onward and upward with its dawning light? There are some mystical and shadowy announcements, made clear, not by what goes before, but by what comes after, both in the Old and New Testament, (and perhaps this is one of them,) where, as Milton says of certain sage and solemn poets of allegory, "more is meant than meets the ear." Who is prepared to say that these expressions were not designed to be the shadowy anticipators and forerunners of that great announcement of the Savior, "My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, *then would my servants fight; but now is my kingdom not from hence?*"

FOURTHLY. The following passage, in the 13th of Romans, where the apostle is speaking of the duty of obedience to rulers, is often brought up, in opposition to the doctrine of non-resistance. "For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; *for he beareth not the sword in vain;* for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." — The reader is requested, if he wishes to have a right understanding of this passage, to read carefully this whole chapter, taken in connection with the latter part of the 12th chapter. If he will do this, he will find that this exceedingly interesting portion of Scripture teaches something very different from a spirit of strife and contention. The leading ideas contained in it are evidently these: (1.) We are to exercise love and forgiveness towards all men, and under all circumstances, whatever their conduct may be towards us. (2.) In the exercise of this spirit of love and forgiveness, it is incumbent upon Christians to render entire submission to the civil and political administration of the country where they reside. Now, when we consider that the primitive Christians lived, in many instances, at least, under administrations of government which were exceedingly unjust, perverse, and cruel, the explicit and urgent directions, contained in the 13th of Romans, to be submissive and obedient to those in authority, must be regarded as any thing rather than contentious and belligerent. Such directions are obviously the natural and true result of those doctrines of love and peace which the Savior himself had so earnestly inculcated. If any people in the world ever had occasion for complaint against those in authority, and strong motives for resistance to them, it was the primitive Christians, at certain periods and in certain countries; but they were required not to resist, not to return evil for evil, to endure every indignity and suffering, even to death itself, rather than lift the hand

against the civil rulers. It is in connection with the announcement of the duty of unreserved submission to rulers, that the magistrate is spoken of as being the minister of God, and as not "bearing the sword in vain." These last expressions are obviously figurative, and convey the simple fact, and nothing more, that the magistrates were both able, and had the disposition, to enforce the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the country. In nine cases out of ten, and probably in ninety-nine out of a hundred, the sword was not used as an instrument of punishment; which of itself, independently of the obvious spirit of the whole passage, requires us to understand the words in question in a general sense, and as expressive, not of a particular mode of punishment, viz., by the sword, but of the mere general fact of the efficiency of the established civil and criminal jurisdiction. That jurisdiction was not to be trifled with; the laws of the land were to be conformed to; civil society, in its great outlines, was to be maintained; it existed with the approbation of God; its authority was to be scrupulously obeyed by Christians, not because that authority was exercised in all respects as it ought to be, but because resistance on the part of Christians, when the magistrate was armed with the sword, or had power to enforce it, necessarily implied violence, which was inconsistent with Christian principles.

FIFTH. It may be objected further, that in Matt. v. 21, where the command, THOU SHALT NOT KILL, is repeated and enforced, the Greek verb PHONEUO does not express the mere fact of putting men to death, and that *only*, but conveys the additional idea of premeditated and criminal homicide. But the truth is, that this term is used in both ways; sometimes to express the mere fact of putting to death, without any additional intimation; and sometimes the putting to death in that particular way which constitutes the crime of murder. Schleusner, who may be regarded as good au-

thority on such a subject, expressly applies it, not only to the person who is guilty of murder, or criminal homicide, but to one who is the cause of death in any manner whatever—"*auctor mortis alicujus quocunque modo.*" In this latter sense it is used frequently in the Septuagint. See Num. xxxv. 6, 11, 12, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30. Deut. iv. 42. v. 17. xix. 6. Josh. x. 28, 35. xx. 5, 6. xxi. 13, 21, 27, 32, 38. 2 Chron. xxv. 3. Ps. lxii. 3. Prov. xxii. 13. Biblical scholars, who are familiar with the characteristics of the Greek of the New Testament, will understand the propriety of this reference to the Septuagint.

But the passage in the 5th of Matthew, which has been particularly referred to, is, in strictness, to be regarded as a mere translation of the 6th commandment; and any question in respect to this passage is to be determined by a reference to the Hebrew verb used in that commandment. The remark already made in respect to the Greek verb PHONEUO, will apply equally well to the Hebrew verb RATZAH, which is there used; viz., that it sometimes means to kill, in the general and unlimited sense of taking life, and sometimes to murder. In proof of the meaning first mentioned, we may properly refer, among other passages, to Prov. xxii. 13: "The slothful man saith, There is a lion without; I *shall be slain* in the streets." Here the Hebrew verb RATZAH is used in the passive form. But this, certainly, — the death occasioned by a lion, — cannot be regarded as a case of criminal homicide, but of mere extinction of life. — Numb. xxxv. 30: "Whosoever killeth any person, the murderer shall be put to death." The word *murderer* and the phrase PUT TO DEATH are the same words in the original, both being only different forms of the Hebrew verb in question; the first expressing criminal homicide, the second putting to death without guilt. See also Num. xxxv. 11, 12, 19, 21, 25, 26, 27. Deut. iv. 42. xix. 6. Josh. xx. 5, 6. xxi. 13, &c. — Both terms,

therefore, the Greek PHONEUO and the Hebrew RATZAH, mean, primarily, to kill, although they not unfrequently mean to murder, or to kill with evil intention. And it seems proper to use them in the general sense, unless there is something in the connection which satisfactorily indicates that they are to be employed in the more limited one.

SIXTH. There is one other passage, which requires to be noticed. Rev. xiii. 10: "*He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity; he that killeth by the sword must be killed by the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints.*" In order to understand this passage, we must look at the connection. The author of the apocalyptic vision saw the symbolic representation of one of the most dreadful persecutions which Christians were ever called to endure. The idolaters of the Roman empire were permitted to make war "with the saints and to overcome them." And profane history relates with what cruelty they prosecuted their victory, and what indescribable sufferings were inflicted upon those who bore the blessed name of the Savior. It is in this connection that the attention of the whole Christian world is particularly requested, by that impressive form of address which is so frequently employed in the book of Revelation, when any thing of importance is to be announced, viz., "If any man have an ear, let him hear." Then follow the words to which we are attending: "He that leadeth into captivity," &c. And what is the object of this announcement, thus solemnly made? It was to let Christians know that, amid all their unspeakable sorrows, their God had not forgotten them; that the day of retribution would surely come; that those who now so cruelly wasted them with the sword and the chain, would, under the administration of God's righteous providence, be doomed, in their own turn, to suffer the miseries which they were now so cruelly inflicting on the innocent

followers of Jesus Christ. This interpretation seems to be rendered clear by the concluding paragraph, viz., "Here is the patience and the faith of the saints." The word which is rendered *here* will bear the interpretation *herein* or *on this account*, (IN HAC RE, as Rosenmueller has it.) That is to say, in consequence of the announcement that the sword and captivity will ultimately, in God's righteous providence, overtake their unholy persecutors, the saints are to continue to exercise faith and patience. And, by implication, the passage evidently requires them not to resist their enemies, but to submit quietly and meekly to the dreadful inflictions to which they were subject, trusting all their troubles into the hands of God, as their great and ultimate avenger. In other words, their faith and patience are based, and stand firm, in this, viz., there is a just God, and a day of retribution coming upon their enemies. In other words, "Avenge not yourselves; vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord."

The foregoing are the prominent objections, so far as we have been able to learn, which have been brought forward, in opposition to the Christian doctrine of the unlawfulness of all war. It is true there are some others, but they are so obviously inapplicable and weak, that they betray the utter unsoundness of the cause they are introduced to support. For instance, it is said that Paul, when certain Jews lay in wait for him, to take away his life, accepted, (or, as Grotius has it,) "did not refuse" the protection of a body of soldiers, and did not state to the tribune and soldiers that the bearing of arms was displeasing to God, which he ought in good conscience to have done, if he believed it to be so. Upon this shadow of an argument, it is enough merely to say, that it was not in the option of Paul either to refuse or not to refuse. He was in close custody, as an accused person, and far from being in a situation to prescribe

terms of action, or forbearance of action, to such civil and military rulers as the Romans. He well knew that he had nothing to do but to submit, and to submit quietly, which was in accordance with his own doctrine of the necessity and duty of obedience to rulers. It is true that it was undoubtedly his duty to preach peace, love, forbearance, and forgiveness, on all suitable occasions; and there is no evidence that he neglected to do so on the occasion now referred to; on the contrary, it is rather probable, if it is worth while to offer mere conjectures and guesses in this matter, that, as he himself was, in his own person, the subject of unjust detention and violence, he took the opportunity to impress on his attendants the cruelty and unlawfulness of their warlike calling.

Again: it is said that the centurion, in the 10th chapter of Acts, who is so favorably spoken of for his prayers and alms, was baptized, and was recognized as a Christian, without being required to lay aside his military profession. It will be noticed that this argument, if such it may be called, is based, like the preceding, not upon any thing *positively* done or said; not upon any precept or injunction expressly given; but upon a mere negation, a mere absence of testimony. Such an argument may have just as much weight, or as little weight, as any one chooses to give it, since it is, in its very nature, wholly conjectural. Whether the apostle Peter, who was the person commissioned to instruct the centurion in the principles of the Christian religion, did, or did not, attempt to explain to him the inconsistency of the practice of war with those principles, cannot now be known. It is probable that the centurion was amply instructed in respect to the pacific nature of the gospel; that it implied unspeakable love in its Author, and required perfect love in those who adopt it; and if he was left to make the practical application of these instructions to his particular situation and calling, it was certainly

nobody's fault but his own, if he lived any longer a soldier.

We now leave the subject, so far as it depends on the doctrines of the New Testament, to the candid consideration of the reader. As the discussion, by the admission of all parties, rests chiefly and ultimately upon the gospel, we ask him to examine it *in the spirit of the gospel.* Let him subdue the elements of war in his own bosom; let him discipline his wayward heart to the high doctrine of perfect love; and then, in the spirit of deep humility and fervent prayer, let him take up the New Testament, and see how much warrant he will find for the shedding of human blood; how much authority he will discover for that course of hostility, violence, and revenge, which have made this fair world one great Aceldama, one vast and horrid place of execution, a reeking and smoking slaughter-house! We doubt not that the time will sooner or later come, when there will be but one opinion on this all-important subject. And shall Christians any longer delay the investigation of it? Shall they sit supinely in their easy-chairs, or walk softly and mincingly to their pulpits, and dream pleasant dreams, and utter soft sayings, as when one playeth on a pleasant instrument, when shrieks and groans arise on every side, and the garments of their brethren are still rolled in blood? Let them pause and consider! The gospel has an impress of its own; it is a distinct entity, a grand and effective fact in the administration of the universe; it has its own character and relations; and is not, as some would seem to imagine, a mere metempsychosis of heathenism, ushering itself into the world under the patronage of a new and lovely name.

CHAPTER TWELFTH.

TESTIMONY AND PRACTICE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS.

We hold the argument from the New Testament to be entirely satisfactory and conclusive in itself. We maintain that it stands unshakenly immovable on its own basis, without depending on collateral and adventitious aid. But still we are not at liberty to reject such aid, but are to avail ourselves of every incidental circumstance which may tend to communicate light and strength. The minds of different individuals are in some respects differently constituted. And, in the conflict of argument, a single circumstance (perhaps a slight and unimportant one in itself) may establish some minds in a correct result, who, without that particular view of the subject, would never have arrived at it.

Hence, before quitting the subject, we are led to suggest another consideration. We naturally inquire, How did the primitive Christians understand the subject? What was the impression of those who stood nearest to the times of Christ, as to what was expected of his followers? Did they, with the example of the Savior, and of the first disciples and apostles, so directly before them, feel at liberty to gird on the sword, and to engage in the dreadful business of shedding human blood? If they did not, then the conclusion at which we have arrived, unanswerably strong as it is in itself, receives new strength, and we are encouraged to act upon it with the greater confidence.

The statements which follow are taken from Clark-

son's Essay on the Doctrines and Practice of the early Christians as they relate to War. They conclusively show that the early Christians generally considered war as unlawful, and declined serving as soldiers. We say *generally*, because there are some expressions in Tertullian and Eusebius, that escaped the notice of Clarkson, which seem to indicate that, about the year 174, there were some Christian soldiers in the Roman army. But such instances were exceptions to the general rule. They seldom occurred; and, for the first century and a half at least, we may undoubtedly pronounce the Christian church, as a body, although there were some exceptions, clear of the unspeakable sin of slaughtering their fellow-men in war. The extract which follows relates to two distinct points, viz., the opinions or doctrines of the early Christian writers on the subject of war, and the practice of those who became Christians.

"FIRST. With respect to the opinions of the first Christian writers after the apostles, or of those who are usually called the Fathers of the church, relative to war, I believe we shall find them alike for nearly three hundred years, if not for a longer period. JUSTIN the Martyr, one of the earliest of those in the second century, *considers war as unlawful.* He makes, also, *the devil the author of all war.*

"TATIAN, who was the disciple of Justin, in his oration to the Greeks, speaks in the same terms on the same subject.

"From the different expressions of CLEMENS of Alexandria, a contemporary of the latter, we collect his opinion to be decisive also against the lawfulness of war.

"TERTULLIAN, who may be mentioned next in order of time, strongly condemned the practice of bearing arms. I shall give one or two extracts from him on this subject. In his dissertation on the Worship of Idols, he says, 'Though the soldiers came to John,

and received a certain form to be observed, and though the centurion believed, yet Jesus Christ, by disarming Peter, disarmed every soldier afterward; for custom never sanctions an unlawful act.' And, in his Soldier's Garland, he says, 'Can a soldier's life be lawful, when Christ has pronounced that he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword? Can one who professes the peaceable doctrines of the gospel, be a soldier, when it is his duty not so much as to go to law? And *shall he who is not to revenge his own wrongs, be instrumental in bringing others into chains, imprisonment, torment, death?*'

"CYPRIAN, in his Epistle to Donatus, speaks thus: 'Suppose thyself with me on the top of some very exalted eminence, and from thence looking down upon the appearances of things below. Let our prospect take in the whole horizon, and let us view, with the indifference of persons not concerned in them, the various motions and agitations of human life. Thou wilt then, I dare say, have a real compassion for the circumstances of mankind, and for the posture in which this view will represent them. And when thou reflectest upon thy condition, thy thoughts will rise in transports of gratitude and praise to God, for having made thy escape from the pollutions of the world. The things thou wilt principally observe, will be the highways beset with robbers, the seas with pirates; encampments, marches, and all the terrible forms of war and bloodshed. When a single murder is committed, it shall be deemed, perhaps, a crime; but that crime shall commence a virtue, when committed under the shelter of public authority; so that punishment is not rated by the measure of guilt; but the more enormous the size of the wickedness is, so much the greater is the chance of impunity.'

"These are the sentiments of CYPRIAN; and that they were the result of his views of Christianity, as

taken from the divine writings, there can be no doubt. If he had stood upon the same eminence, and beheld the same sights, previously to his conversion, he would, like others, have neither thought piracy dishonorable, nor war inglorious.

"LACTANTIUS, who lived some time after Cyprian, in his treatise concerning the true worship of God, says, 'It can never be lawful for a righteous man to go to war, whose warfare is in righteousness itself.'

"To these may be added Archelaus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerom, and Cyril, all of whom were of opinion that it was unlawful for Christians to go to war.

"SECOND. With respect to the practice of the early Christians, which is the next point to be considered, it may be observed that there is no well-authenticated instance upon record of Christians entering into the army for nearly the two first centuries; but it is true, on the other hand, that they had declined the military profession, as one in which it was not lawful for them to engage.

"The first species of evidence to this point may be found in the following facts, which reach from about the year 170 to about the year 195. Cassius had rebelled against the emperor Verus, and was slain in a short time afterwards. Clodius Albinus, in one part of the world, and Pescennius Niger, in another, had rebelled against the emperor Severus, and both were slain. Now suspicion fell, as it always did in these times, if any thing went wrong, upon the Christians, as having been concerned upon these occasions; but Tertullian tells us, in his Discourse to Scapula, that this suspicion was totally groundless. 'You defamed us,' [Christians,] says he, 'by charging us with having been guilty of treason to our emperors; but not a Christian could be found in any of the rebel armies, whether commanded by Cassius, Albinus, or Niger.' These, then, are important facts, — for the

armies in question were very extensive. Cassius was master of all Syria, with its four legions; Niger, of the Asiatic and Egyptian legions; and Albinus, of those of Britain; which legions together contained between a third and a half of the standing legions of Rome; and the circumstance that no Christian was to be found in them is the more remarkable, because, according to the same Tertullian, Christianity had then spread over almost the whole of the known world.

"A second species of evidence may be collected from expressions and declarations in the works of certain authors of those times. Justin the Martyr, and Tatian, make distinctions between soldiers and Christians; and Clemens of Alexandria gives the Christians who were contemporary with him the appellation of the '*Peaceable*,' thus distinguishing them from others of the world; and he says, expressly, that the 'Peaceable' never used sword or bow, — meaning by these the instruments of war.

"A third species of evidence may be found in the belief which the writers of these times had, that the prophecy of Isaiah, which predicted that men should turn their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, was then in the act of completion.

"Irenæus, who flourished about the year 180, affirms that this famous prophecy had been completed in his time. 'For the Christians,' says he, 'have changed their swords and their lances into instruments of peace, and *they know not how to fight*.' Justin the Martyr, who was contemporary with Irenæus, asserts the same thing, which he could not have done if the Christians in his time had engaged in war. 'That the prophecy,' says he, 'is fulfilled, you have good reason to believe; for *we, who in times past killed one another, do not now fight with our enemies*.' And here it is observable that the Greek word

'*fight*' does not mean to strike, or to beat, or to give a blow, but actually to *fight as in war;* and the Greek word '*enemy*' does not mean a private adversary, or one who has injured us, but *an enemy of the state;* and the sentence which follows that which has been given, puts the matter out of all doubt. Tertullian, who lived after both, speaks in these remarkable words: 'Deny that these (meaning the turning of swords into ploughshares) are the things prophesied of, when you see what you see, or that they are the things fulfilled when you read what you read; but if you deny neither of these positions, then you must confess that the prophecy has been accomplished, as far as the practice of every individual is concerned to whom it is applicable.' We might go from Tertullian even as far as Theodoret, if it were necessary, to show that the prophecy in question was considered as in the act of completion in those times.

"The fourth and last species of evidence may be found in the assertions of Celsus, and in the reply of Origen to that writer. Celsus, who lived at the end of the second century, attacked the Christian religion. He made it one of his charges against the Christians, that they refused, in his times, to bear arms for the emperor, even in the case of necessity, and when their services would have been accepted. He told them further, that if the rest of the empire were of their opinion, it would soon be overrun by the barbarians. Now, Celsus dared not have brought this charge against the Christians, if the fact had not been publicly known. But let us see whether it was denied by those who were of opinion that his work demanded a reply. The person who wrote against him in favor of Christianity, was Origen, who lived in the third century. But Origen, in his answer, admits the facts as stated by Celsus, that the Christians would not bear arms in his time, and justifies them

for refusing the practice on the principle of the unlawfulness of war.

"And as the early Christians would not enter into the armies, so there is good ground to suppose that, when they became converted there, they relinquished their profession. We find from Tertullian, in his Soldier's Garland, that many, in his time, immediately on their conversion to Christianity, quitted the military service. We are told, also, by Archelaus, who flourished under Probus, in the year 278, that many Roman soldiers, who had embraced Christianity, after having witnessed the piety and generosity of Marcellus, immediately forsook the profession of arms. We are told, also, by Eusebius, that, about the same time, 'numbers laid aside a military life, and became private persons, rather than abjure their religion.'

"Here, then, is a collection of evidence and facts, attending to show that, for nearly the first two hundred years after the introduction of Christianity into the world, none of those who professed to be Christians, would either take upon themselves or continue the profession of soldiers."

Mr. Clarkson then considers an objection which will be likely to be made, viz., that the military oath which the Roman soldiers were required to take, was full of idolatry; that the Roman standards were considered as gods, and had divine honors paid to them; and that the Christians of that time refused to serve as soldiers, not because they objected to war in itself, but because they objected to the idolatry connected with it. Mr. Clarkson admits that there is some weight in this objection; he does not deny that the idolatrous customs and tests of the Roman armies operated to the exclusion of Christians; but he very properly maintains that this was not the only cause of their exclusion, and goes on still more fully to show, that a leading cause was the belief of Chris-

tians in the unlawfulness of war, *in itself considered.* He remarks as follows: "Every Christian writer of the second century, who notices the subject, makes it unlawful for Christians to bear arms. And as this belief seems to have been universal, so it operated as an impediment to a military life, quite as much as the idolatry that was connected with it, of which the following instances, taken by way of illustration, though at somewhat different periods, may suffice.

"The first I propose to mention shall be, where there was an objection to entering into the military service upon this very principle.

"Maximilian having been brought before the tribunal, in order to be enrolled as a soldier, Dion, the proconsul, asked him his name. Maximilian, turning to him, replied, 'Why wouldst thou know my name? I am a Christian, and cannot fight.'

"Then Dion ordered him to be enrolled; and, when he was enrolled, it was recited out of the register that he was five feet ten inches high. Immediately after this, Dion bade the officer mark him. But Maximilian refused to be marked, still asserting that he was a Christian; upon which Dion instantly replied, 'Bear arms, or thou shalt die.'

"To this Maximilian answered, 'I cannot fight, if I die: I am not a soldier of this world, but a soldier of God.' Dion then said, 'Who has persuaded thee to behave thus?' Maximilian answered, 'My own mind, and he who called me.' Dion then spoke to his father, and bade him persuade his son. But his father observed that his son knew his own mind, and what it was best for him to do.

"After this had passed, Dion addressed Maximilian again in these words: 'Take thy arms, and receive the mark.' 'I can receive,' says Maximilian, 'no such mark. I have already the mark of Christ;' upon which Dion said, 'I will send thee quickly to

thy Christ.' 'Thou mayest do so,' says Maximilian; 'but the glory will be mine.'

"Dion then bade the officer mark him. But Maximilian still persisted in refusing, and spoke thus: 'I cannot receive the mark of this world, and, if thou shouldst give me the mark, I will destroy it. It will avail nothing. I am a Christian, and it is not lawful for me to wear such a mark about my neck, when I have received the saving mark of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, whom thou knowest not, who died to give us life, and whom God gave for our sins. Him all we Christians obey. Him we follow, as the Restorer of our life, and the Author of our salvation.'

"Dion instantly replied to this, 'Take thy arms, and receive the mark, or thou shalt suffer a miserable death.' 'But I shall not perish,' says Maximilian; 'my name is already enrolled with Christ, — I cannot fight.'

"Dion said, 'Consider, then, thy youth, and bear arms. The profession of arms becomes a young man.' Maximilian replied, 'My arms are with the Lord. I cannot fight for any earthly consideration. I am now a Christian.'

"Dion, the proconsul, said, 'Among the life-guards of our masters, Dioclesian and Maximilian, and Constantius and Maximus, there are Christian soldiers, and they fight.' Maximilian answered, 'They know best what is expedient for them; but I am a Christian, and it is unlawful to do evil.'

"Dion said, 'Take thy arms; despise not the profession of a soldier, lest thou perish miserably.' 'But I shall not perish,' says Maximilian; 'and if I should leave this world, my soul will live with Christ the Lord.'

"Dion then ordered his name to be struck from the roll; and, when this was done, he proceeded — 'Because, out of thy rebellious spirit, thou hast refused to

bear arms, thou shalt be punished according to thy deserts, for an example to others.' And then he delivered the following sentence: 'Maximilian, because thou hast, with a rebellious spirit, refused to bear arms, thou art to die by the sword.' Maximilian replied, 'Thanks be to God.'

"He was twenty years, three months, and seventeen days old; and, when he was led to the place of execution, he spoke thus: 'My dear brethren, endeavor, with all your might, that it may be your portion to see the Lord, and that he may give you such a crown.' And then, with a pleasant countenance, he said to his father, 'Give the executioner the soldier's coat that thou hast gotten for me; and, when I shall receive thee in the company of the blessed martyrs, we may rejoice together with the Lord.'

"After this, he suffered. His mother, Pompeiana, obtained his body from the judge, and conveyed it to Carthage, and buried it near the place where the body of CYPRIAN the martyr lay. And, thirteen days after this, his mother died, and was buried in the same place. And Victor, his father, returned to his habitation, rejoicing and praising God, that he had sent before such a gift to the Lord, himself expecting to follow after.

"We shall only observe upon this instance, that it is nearly pure and unmixed, or that it is but little connected with idolatrous circumstances; or, rather, that the unlawfulness of fighting was principally urged by Maximilian as a reason against entering into a military life. Let us now find a case, where, when a person was converted in the army, he left it, pleading this principle again, as one among others, for his dereliction of it.

"Marcellus was a centurion in the legion called Trajana. On a festival given in honor of the birthday of Galerius, he threw down his military belt at the head of the legion, and, in the face of the standards, declared, with a loud voice, that he would no longer

serve in the army, for that he had become a Christian. 'I hold in detestation,' says he, addressing himself to all the soldiers, 'the worship of your gods; gods which are made of wood and stone; gods which are deaf and dumb.' So far Marcellus, it appears, seems to have been influenced in his desertion of a military life by the idolatry connected with it. But let us hear him further on this subject. 'It is not lawful,' says he, 'for a Christian, who is the servant of Christ the Lord, to bear arms for any earthly consideration.' After a delay of more than three months in prison after this transaction, which delay was allowed for the purpose of sparing him, he was brought before the prefect. There he had an opportunity of correcting his former expressions. But, as he persisted in the same sentiments, he suffered. It is remarkable that, almost immediately after his execution, Cassian, who was the notary to the same legion, refused to serve any longer, by publicly throwing his pen and account-book on the ground, and declaring, at the same time, that the sentence of Marcellus was unjust. When taken up by the order of Aurelianus Agricolanus, he is described by the record preserved by Ruinart to have avowed the same sentiments as Marcellus, and like him to have suffered death.

"Let us now find a case where a converted soldier left the army, pleading the same principle. Martin, of whom Sulpicius Severus says so much, had been bred to the profession of arms, but, on his conversion to Christianity, declined it. In the answer which he gave to Julian the Apostate for his conduct on this occasion, we find him making use of these words: 'I am a Christian, and therefore I cannot fight.'

"And here it may be observed, that, though the noble martyrs, now mentioned, grounded their apology for declining the military service, some on account of the idolatry which belonged to it, and others of the un-

lawfulness of fighting, yet that which was more usually set up by them, when they were brought before the tribunals, was comprehended in the simple declaration, that, having now become Christians, they could be no longer soldiers. Let us quote the instance of Tarachus, another military man and martyr, and let this serve for all. Tarachus underwent his examination at Tarsus, in Cilicia. Numerianus Maximus sat, as the president, on the judgment-seat. 'What is your name?' says Maximus. 'I am called Tarachus (says the prisoner) by my father, but my military name is Victor.' The president goes on: 'And what is your condition?' The prisoner replies, 'I have led a military life, and am a Roman. I was born at Claudiopolis, a city of Isauria, and, because I am a Christian, I have abandoned my profession of a soldier.' Such was the answer usually given to the tribunals on such occasions, without any specification as to which of the two principles had influenced the conduct of those who were brought before them; and, whenever we hear of such general apology or answer, we cannot doubt that they who made use of it were actuated by both. The unlawfulness of fighting was as much a principle of religion, in the early times of Christianity, as the refusal of sacrifice to the heathen gods; and they operated equally to prevent men from entering into the army, and to drive them out of it on their conversion. Indeed, these principles always went together, where the profession of arms presented itself as an occupation for a Christian. He who refused the profession on account of the idolatry connected with it, would have refused it on account of the unlawfulness of fighting; and he who refused it on account of the guilt of fighting, would have refused it on account of the idolatrous services it required. Both and each of them were impediments, in the early part of Christianity, to a military life."

To these extracts (the reader will excuse the length of them for the interesting matter they contain) we take the liberty to add another, on the same topic, from Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire: "The Christians were not less averse to the business than to the pleasures of this world. The defence of our persons and property they knew not how to reconcile with the patient doctrine which enjoined an unlimited forgiveness of past injuries, and commanded them to invite the repetition of fresh insults. Their simplicity was offended by the use of oaths, by the pomp of magistracy, and by the active contention of public life; nor could their humane ignorance be convinced that it was lawful, on any occasion, to shed the blood of our fellow-creatures, either by the sword of justice or by that of war, even though their criminal or hostile attempts should threaten the peace and safety of the whole community. It was acknowledged that, under a less perfect law, the powers of the Jewish constitution had been exercised, with the approbation of Heaven, by inspired prophets and anointed kings. The Christians felt and confessed that such institutions might be necessary for the present system of the world, and they cheerfully submitted to the authority of their pagan governors. But, while they inculcated the maxims of passive obedience, they refused to take any active part in the civil administration or the military defence of the empire. Some indulgence might, perhaps, be allowed to those persons who, before their conversion, were already engaged in such violent and sanguinary occupations; but it was impossible that Christians, without renouncing a more sacred duty, could assume the character of soldiers, of magistrates, or of princes."

There is one fact worthy of notice, because it is farther back in the history of the primitive Christians, than any thing which has been mentioned. The city of Jerusalem, it will be recollected, was utterly de-

stroyed in about forty years after the crucifixion of our Savior, and the whole nation was overthrown in a most wonderful and unparalleled manner. The Savior had foretold this destruction: the Christians, who were now very numerous, (for there was many thousands of them so early as the period when Paul attended the meeting of the elders at Jerusalem,) distinctly saw the approach of a contest which would overwhelm their beloved city and country. But it does not appear from any thing said in Josephus, or by any writer of that time, that they took any part in that dreadful contest. On the contrary, knowing that their principles were inconsistent with the bloody scenes which were at hand, they intrusted themselves to the divine protection, and made their escape out of the city in the best way they could. A great body of them, as we learn from Eusebius, (Book III. chap. 5,)* resorted to a village of the name of Pella, beyond the River Jordan, and, secured by nothing but their benevolent and pacific principles, were preserved safe amid the desolations and bloodshed around them.

In the conclusion of this topic, we would briefly remark that we do not wish to be understood as maintaining that the doctrines and practice of the primitive Christians are absolutely and in all respects binding upon us. We know that they are not, whenever they are at variance with the doctrines of the gospel, and with the practice which the gospel requires. If they had been more united and harmonious in their abhorrence of war, and in their repugnance to military service, than they appear to have been, even that would not have rendered an appeal to the gospel unnecessary. Every one is required to make up a judgment for himself, on the infallible testimony of the Word of God. And yet we cannot deny, that it is a circumstance calculated to confirm our faith, and to give

* See also Milner's Church History, Cent. I.

substantial encouragement, that apparently so large a number of the primitive followers of Christ, amid all the warlike prejudices of their age, and under the frown of Roman tyranny, refused to bear the sword against their fellow-men, because they considered it to be inconsistent with their Christian profession. Blessed and glorious words of Maximilian — "*I am a Christian, and cannot fight!*"

CHAPTER THIRTEENTH.

OF WAR IN CONNECTION WITH THE MILLENNIUM.

THERE is one view of this subject, which has almost entirely escaped notice, but which, while it must be exceedingly interesting to every one, will, perhaps, on some minds, make a stronger impression than any other aspect in which it has been contemplated. It is this: *War, in all its forms, is obviously inconsistent with the millennial state.*

In the first place, what do we understand by the millennium, or the millennial state of the world? We mean a state where the principles of the gospel will be recognized, felt, and put in practice; we mean a state where men will sincerely worship God, and will truly and ardently love each other; where there will be no contention, no jealousy, no acts of retaliation, no strife. This is the view we entertain of it, and which, if we do not misinterpret them, we are authorized to entertain by the Scriptures. In every age of the world, since the coming of Christ, there has been essentially but one opinion on this subject. Amid all the trials which the church has passed through, amid all the thick darkness in which she has been occasionally involved, the faith of the devoted Christian has always invincibly attached itself to this great result. He has believed, and firmly and unalterably believed, that a day of universal peace and purity would at last come; a day "when they shall not hurt nor destroy in all the holy mountain."

"Beneath its trees, that spread their blooming light,
The spotted leopard walks; the ox is there;

The yellow lion stands in conscious might,
Breathing the dewy and illumined air.
A little child doth take him by the mane,
And leads him forth, and plays beneath his breast.
Nought breaks the quiet of that blest domain,
Nought mars its harmony and heavenly rest—
Picture divine and emblem of that day
When peace on earth and truth shall hold unbroken sway."

In the second place, how shall this result be secured and perpetuated? Are we to expect a new code, and a new system of methods of operation? Are we to expect a new Savior, a new crucifixion, a new and amended edition of the New Testament? Certainly not. The doctrines of the millennium are the doctrines of to-day; the principles of the millennium are the very principles which are obligatory on the men of the present generation; the bond which will exclude all contention, and will bind together all hearts, will be nothing more nor less than the Gospel of Christ.

The Gospel is a book of principles—of great, operative, and unchangeable principles. Men condemn it, because they do not understand it; even Christians may be fairly charged with treating it with no small degree of disregard, because, in their worldliness, they have neglected to estimate its heights and depths. If heaven could be brought down to earth — if Europe and America, and all other continents and parts of the world, could, at the present moment, be peopled with angels, and with seraphic natures, — the Gospel, just as it stands, would be sufficient to guide and govern them. The blessed companies of the heavenly world, unlike the children of men, would ask no higher and better code. But can we regard it as allowable, could we conceive of it as allowable, under any assignable circumstances, for an angel to retaliate upon an angel, for a seraph to exercise hostility upon a seraph, for one of these holy beings to hold in his own hands the

right of extinguishing the life of another? What sort of heaven would that be, which should be characterized by the admission of such a principle? And we may ask, further, What sort of a *millennium* will that be, which shall be characterized, either practically or theoretically, in the same way? When men are fully restored to the favor of God, whether in heaven or earth, is there to be one code, one set of governmental principles for them, and another for other holy beings? Certainly not. In all the great matters of right and duty, the law of seraphs is the law of angels, and the law of angels is the law of men. If it is utterly and absolutely inconsistent with our conceptions of the heavenly world, that the power of life and death should be taken from the hands of Jehovah, and that angels and seraphs should have the right of extinguishing each other's existence, it is equally difficult to conceive of such a right in the millennium. And if it will not be right for the men of the millennium to exercise the power of life and death over each other, it is not right for them now. We have the same code of government now which we shall have then; we have the New Testament now, and we shall have it then; and not only that, we shall understand it better and love it more. Nothing will be added to it; nothing will be taken from it. If it does not now consider human life inviolable, it never will; if it does not now proscribe all wars among the human species, it never will: the right of taking human life, if it exists now under the Christian code, will exist as a legal and authorized characteristic (painful and even horrible as the mere thought is) of the pure, blessed, and angelic state of the millennium. On the supposition, therefore, that life will be inviolable in the millennium, and that it will not be considered right for one man to put another to death for any possible reason, we argue that it is not right now. And this form of reasoning is applicable to any other analo-

gous case whatever. If it will not be right to steal in the millennium, it is not right to steal now; if it will not be right to be intemperate in the millennium, it is not right to be intemperate now; if it will not be right to hold slaves in the millennium, it is not right to hold slaves now; if it will not be right to take life and carry on war in the millennium, it is not right to take life and to carry on war now. The principles which will be acknowledged as authoritative in the millennium, are the very principles which are prescribed, and are binding upon us, at the present moment. No change in principles is required, but merely a change in practice. If the practice of men should to-morrow be conformed to the principles which the finger of God has written on the pages of the New Testament, then to-morrow would behold the millennium.

We delight to linger upon this subject. There is a charm in the millennial name. "Scribenti manum injicit, et quamlibet festinantem in se morari cogit." The wing of poetry flags under this great conception. Sometimes we see it under the type of a wilderness newly clothed with bud and blossom; sometimes we see it under the type of a city descending from heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband; sometimes we behold it as a great temple, arising out of the earth, and capacious enough to contain all nations. This temple is not built of earthly materials, that will perish with the using, but is supported on immutable columns. Every great moral and religious principle is a pillar in the millennial temple. The principle of total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors is one pillar; it suddenly arose fair and beautiful, and even now is enveloped with some rays of millennial glory: the doctrine that all slave-holding is a sin is another pillar, standing firm, awfully grand and immovable: the doctrine of the absolute inviolability of human life is another; this is in a

state of preparation, but it will soon ascend, and stand brightly and majestically in its place; and thus principle after principle will be established, column after column will be erected, till the spiritual house of the Lord shall be established in the tops of the mountains, and shall expand upon the eye of the beholder far more beautiful than the Parthenon. And what then will be wanting? Only that the nations, in the language of prophecy, shall flow into it; only that the people should occupy it, and rejoice in it; and this is millennial glory. But, unless you have firm, unchangeable, immutable principles, it will be like a certain house, that was built upon the sand; "and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell, and great was the fall of it."

CHAPTER FOURTEENTH.

POPULAR OBJECTIONS.

When the doctrine of entire abstinence from war, both offensive and defensive, is asserted and maintained, it is so far in advance both of public sentiment and public practice, that we are at once met with a host of objections. Some good men, who, in the main, are averse to violent and sanguinary measures, are greatly alarmed at its announcement, on the ground that, if it should prevail, there would be no personal or political safety. Some of the objections which are made may appear to be trivial; undoubtedly they are so; but if they are frequently made, and have influence with the popular mind, they seem to require a word of notice. This is to be said, however, that these objections multiply themselves so rapidly, and assume so many shapes, that we can afford to give only a few specimens, leaving the rest to be supplied by the reader's imagination.

I. One man says, for instance, if a person, or a number of persons, should commence a violent attack upon you, to the hazard even of your life, what would you do? This is my answer: I would do as the Savior did on a certain occasion, Luke iv. 28—30: "And all they in the synagogue, when they heard these things, were filled with wrath; and rose up, and thrust him out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon the city was built, that they might cast him down headlong. *But he, passing through the midst of them, went his way.*" In other words, (by what means we cannot tell,) HE MADE HIS ESCAPE.

Or, I would do as the apostle Paul did, when the Jews of Damascus took counsel to kill him, Acts ix. 23—25: "But their laying wait was known of Saul; and they watched the gates day and night to kill him. Then the disciples took him by night, *and let him down by the wall in a basket.*"

Or, if I could not escape, I would strive by superior skill or physical power to disarm the man, as an act of benevolence to him, as well as of duty to myself, and yet without endangering his life, or injury to his person. In other words, I would do as David did on a certain occasion: I would take away the spear of the assailant, but with a sacred care not to use it against him. I certainly should not feel at liberty, under any provocation whatever, or any pressure of danger, to forget the sublime and instructive declaration of the Savior, already repeatedly referred to: "My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered unto the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence." Every thing should be done in love, and without any possible injury to the assailant. And there can be but little doubt that this course of kindness, patience, and forbearance, especially if it were combined with affectionate entreaty and remonstrance, would prove a successful one. But if it should prove otherwise, — if it should clearly appear that all this would not avail, and that certain destruction stared me in the face, if I acted as a Christian, — I should most seriously endeavor to imitate the example of the Savior, when he died in agony on the cross: "*Father, forgive them; they know not what they do.*"

II. We have sometimes heard the question put, as if it were almost decisive of the right to use force and to destroy life, whether it would not be right to attack a slave ship, loaded with slaves from Africa. In answer to an inquiry of this kind, we would ask,

in the first place, whether the plan of attempting to put an end to the slave trade by force, which has been in progress some fifteen or twenty years, has done any good. And we hesitate nothing in saying that, in the minds of many judicious people, it is very questionable whether it has not in fact increased the evils which it was intended to diminish. Certain it is, that the slave trade, up to the present moment, has not been essentially diminished; and whatever diminution has taken place is probably owing to other causes. We are indeed compelled to admit that the slave traders take more precautions than they used to do; their vessels are modelled, much more than they were formerly, with a view to fast sailing; but this only increases the wretchedness of the poor slaves. And if, at any time, the vessels of the slave traders are likely to be overtaken by hostile ships of war, they do not hesitate, shocking as the very thought is, to throw the miserable Africans overboard. If, then, we shall do no good by resorting to force, and shall probably do evil, it would not be an easy matter to show that we are under obligations to make that resort.

But, while we throw out this view of the subject as worthy of some consideration, we would take the liberty to say, further, that there is a much easier way of putting a stop to the slave trade, which ought at least to be tried before we resort to the awful remedy of shedding human blood. The slave trade can be stopped at once by destroying the market at home; or, in other words, by the suppression of slavery. Here is a Christian remedy; let us try this first, before we resort to another, which is obviously of doubtful utility, besides being opposed to the gospel. It is we who *make* slave traders by keeping open the slave market; we have done wrong in the first instance by purchasing the slaves, and by thus encouraging the cupipity of these traders; we are not at liberty, on

any sound principles, to take advantage of our own wrong, and to make it an excuse for wrong in another shape. If, when we do right ourselves, by breaking the yoke of bondage, and treating the millions of Africans in Christian countries as our fellowmen, the great evil of the slave trade does not cease and die of itself, then we shall be called upon, with some show of propriety, to answer the inquiry concerning the application of force.

III. Another objection (one which may be supposed to have considerable weight with many minds in this country) is, that, on peace principles, the leaders and agents in the American revolution were wrong. In remarking upon this difficulty, we do not deny that the leading men of the American revolution were the true friends of their country; that they in general acted from public, and not from private and selfish, considerations; and that they deserve, on many accounts, to be held in most respectful and affectionate remembrance. Furthermore, they were right in their *principle*, as we believe; and Great Britain was wrong. But we as firmly believe (if we estimate the matter, not by the natural sentiments of mankind, but by the principles of the gospel) that they were wrong in the measures they pursued. And, if they had pursued different measures, such as would have been entirely consistent with the spirit of the gospel, and had persevered in them, we have no doubt that all the valuable results of the revolution would have been ultimately gained.

The measure most likely to have secured their object, would have been earnest, respectful, and patient remonstrance, combined with some measures of a negative kind, such as refusing to use those things which were unjustly taxed. Nor do we hazard much in this remark, since the course was tried in opposition to the early movements of British oppression, and with a great degree of success. The principle

for which our revolutionary fathers contended, was the acknowledged and important principle of the English constitution, that the right of taxation depends on representation. One of the first measures of the English ministry, after they had adopted the plan of taxing America, without, at the same time, permitting her to be represented in parliament, was the imposition of stamp duties on most of the instruments in common use, which duties were to be paid to the officers appointed by the crown. This was in 1765. And what was the course which was then pursued by America? Not a resort to violence; not an appeal to arms; not the shedding of blood; but simply earnest and patient remonstrance, combined with a concerted and general abstinence from the use of stamps. The consequence was, that, in due season, the English ministry was changed, and the measure was abandoned. Some years afterwards, the English government tried again its measures of oppression, by imposing a tax on tea and a few other articles. If the same course of remonstrance, and abstinence from the use of the articles taxed, had been pursued for any considerable time, we may reasonably suppose that the same results would have followed. And not only that; the English people and the English parliament would soon have felt and recognized the justice of our claims in other respects, and have conceded the great principle of actual American representation in the parliament of England. This would have fully satisfied America for many years; but the time would have sooner or later arrived, when America, by the full and free consent of Great Britain, would have separated from the mother country, and taken a stand among nations, without that vast amount of crime and misery which attended the war, and without that mutual jealousy and hostility which have existed in a painful degree ever since.

We believe that this is a view of the subject which candid and intelligent men are generally disposed to take at the present time. Those who are acquainted with the parliamentary history of England, know that America, at a very early period, had able advocates in parliament, who maintained her cause on constitutional grounds, and that the public feeling of England, previous to the actual breaking out of hostilities, was setting strongly in the direction which has been intimated. We have good reasons, therefore, for asserting and maintaining, that resistance to England on gospel principles — the mere resistance of abstinence from the articles taxed, and of respectful and persevering remonstrance — would have ultimately secured all those objects which, on worldly principles, could only be secured (and were, in *fact*, secured) by a long series of hostilities, by tears, and agony, and blood. The objections, therefore, to the doctrines of peace, which are drawn from the facts of our revolutionary history, are of no weight.

IV. Supposing, says another objector, that a band of pirates should assail the town, of which you happened to be the responsible magistrate; what must be done then? This inquiry is answered with so much sincerity and eloquence in one of the last productions of the late lamented Grimké, that we cannot forbear quoting it. Most earnestly do we commend it to the serious attention of the reader. And we fully believe, if he has the spirit of the gospel, he will not be at a loss in what way a Christian should meet the attacks, even of the most infuriated and abandoned assailants.

"A. has supposed me the chief magistrate of Charleston, and that the city was attacked by pirates. 'Is it possible,' he asks, 'that he could give such an interpretation to the gospel, as to surrender the city?' Does A. seriously ask what I would do? Can he doubt? But I will tell him. A Christian magistrate

acknowledges the Bible as above all government, and the law of love and forgiveness as above all human regulations. If he cannot hold his office consistently with the obligations of that book, and the teachings of that law, he will resign. That is precisely what I should do. If my fellow-citizens opjected, I should tell them that I must do my duty. But if I had, on the contrary, a Christian people in spirit and in truth, on the principles of peace, I should make proclamation that all the churches be opened, and that prayer be offered, by the clergy and all the pious, that God would be pleased to change the hearts of our invaders, and to manifest his power and mercy in our deliverance. That done, I should throw open the gate that fronted the enemy. Thence would I issue forth, not with a band of cavalry and infantry, as A. would do, but with all the clergy, and a long procession of Sunday school teachers and scholars, dressed in the white robes of peace, and chanting no battle-song of 'The Bruce,' but the hymn of Christian faith and hope. Does A. believe me in earnest? I appeal to his own heart. Will he not acknowledge that, if ever 'the effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much,' it must be, it would be, then? Can he doubt that such a spectacle would soften the hearts, and change the purposes, of that 'band of greedy, lustful, bloodthirsty pirates?' O that he were there! for he himself would bid me, with such a spirit, to trust myself and the city, not to the cannon and musket, but to God.

"Would not the force of truth, and the power of faith, and the pathetic beauty of the scene, compel him to exclaim, 'If ye are to fall, it is better to perish in the spirit of innocence, forgiveness, and love, — praying, like Stephen, for your murderers, — than to die suicides and murderers yourselves?' Would he not say, as he stood in the rampart, and beheld that Christian army, with its Christian music of holy

song, — would he not exclaim, 'The faith of a Roman mother saved Rome from Coriolanus; and shall not Christian faith save this city, even from pirates?'

"But let us reason a little on the supposed case: take A.'s mode of proceeding. Is he sure of success? He, and all on his side, argue as though they were sure. But they are not sure. The goodness of a cause does not command success. 'The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong.' Now, I will grant that, in my case, I should not be sure of success. We are then on a level. A. will not say that I would not succeed. Now, suppose I do succeed. I have turned enemies into friends. Perhaps I have made such an impression on that sinful company, that they abandon their wicked lives, and become Christian brothers. Suppose A. to succeed; what then? The survivors are implacable enemies, and will assuredly take a dark and terrible vengeance at some other time. There may be joy for the present, but no peace or security for the future. Besides, although he has saved the bodies of his fellow-citizens, he has sent a hundred impenitent souls to the lake of fire. Is this to trust in God? Is this to love our fellow-men? If there be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just men that need no repentance, what joy shall there be in hell over a hundred impenitent sinners, sent to perdition by the bayonets of Christian clergymen and their flocks?

"But I may fail. Granted; and what then? Would we not die, the innocent by the hands of the guilty, the faithful by the hands of the unbelieving? Would we not die the death of the merciful, of the peace-maker? and would we not have their reward? Would we not obtain mercy? and be called the children of God?

"But A.'s plan of defence may also fail. If so, will his city fare better than mine? Will he not acknowl-

edge that in every respect it must fare worse? If he will not acknowledge this as a general rule, notwithstanding what may possibly happen in one case out of a hundred, I am sure every other reader of the Calumet will. Whether, then, we succeed or fail, I have the advantage of A.; and what an advantage is that which is built on faith in God and love to man!

"But let me give A. a stronger example, because matured, and to have been executed, without faltering, if I know myself. It is not, perhaps, understood, that, after the passage of the ordinance of the 24th of November, 1832, the state of parties was such, in Charleston, that, if blood had been shed on either side, in the streets, there is reason to believe that armed and furious mobs would have exhibited scenes unparalleled in our happy country. As in all such cases, the most obnoxious must expect the most terrible fate. Although I had taken the middle ground of peace, had publicly declared that, cost what it might, I would not bear arms in any conflict between the state and Union, yet I knew that my letter of December 1, 1832, 'to the people of South Carolina,' on the subject of that ordinance, had not only caused the rejection of my petition to the legislature for exemption from militia duty, but had been represented as a violent and inflammatory production. I had reason, therefore, to believe that my house would have been an object of attack. I had resolved neither to prepare for defence, nor to accept any offer of protection, should any be made. I should have removed all arms out of my house, and prohibited, absolutely, the attempt to use or conceal any. My family should not have been sent away, unless they had been unwilling to remain with me. For one, at least, I could have answered to have stood by me with a more faithful love in death, even than in life. The doors and windows should have been open, and the rooms lighted as usual.

I should have gone forth to meet them, and to speak, if they would have heard me, such words as God would have enabled me to utter. I may have died the death of Coligny, but it would have been the death which became the faith and love of a Christian. My family would have lost a husband and father, but then he would have been unspattered by a brother's blood; he would have sent no guilty spirit, unprepared, into the world of woe.

"We may well conclude by a parallel in my own case, like that in the case of the pirates. If I had succeeded with my exasperated fellow-citizens, and they had departed in peace, what cause should I not have had for gratitude to God! If I had failed, what more would have been lost than my own life? With that, it is most likely, the mob would have been content, and my family and their property would have been spared. But suppose it had been A.'s case. As soon as he knew the state of the city, he would have prepared for war. The house of prayer would soon have become a fortress, and muskets and pistols, ammunition and swords, would have been provided for the slaughter, perhaps, of some of the communicants of A.'s own church, in the midst of their sins. Let the time of trial come. The battle rages. What destruction, not only of his own, but of his neighbors' property! What rage and blasphemy from the baffled mob! Look at the dying and wounded. Hear their shrieks and curses. Turn to the house. Look at the minister of the gospel taking deliberate, deadly aim at his neighbor, acquaintance, communicant, to slay him for eternal misery! Look at those men, the elders and deacons of Christian churches. How calm, resolute, silent! What thoughts are in their souls! What, but the ejaculations, 'My God! give me a firm heart and steady hand; forgive me if I break thy law, "Thou shalt not kill:" may every shot tell until the murderers desist! Bless me in this work of blood;

my trust is in thee.' But the mob is repelled; they depart, breathing out threatenings and slaughter against A. and his company. Did A. live under the Mosaic dispensation, his prayer of praise and thanksgiving might be conceived in the spirit of the Old Testament hymns for victory. Did he live in the age of the Crusaders, or in that of the Puritans of England, or the Covenanters of Scotland, his prayer would breathe the spirit of the elegies of Tyrtæus, not of the sermon on the mount. But how a Christian minister, the chief actor in such a scene, could offer prayer to a God of holiness, through the Prince of Peace and love, for such a result, I am at a loss to comprehend.

"Let us now reverse the scene. The mob succeed 'The house is taken by storm. The mob burst in with howls and cries more wild and terrific than the Indian war-whoop; for civilized man, when maddened, is more savage than the savage. How many lives on both sides are lost in that furious struggle! The mob rush in on every side, and the assailed, driven from room to room, are hurled from the windows, or slain within. A. falls with the rest, and goes to give his account for having suffered, when he could have prevented many, if not all, the agonies and miseries of that scene. Can a Christian read, and not tremble at the thought that he should have *any* hand in those crimes and horrors?

"Now, will not A. acknowledge that, as a Christian, I have the advantage of him both ways? If I succeed, what a contrast to his success! If I fail, perhaps only a single life is lost, and some property injured. If he fail, what destruction of property, what waste of life, what ruin of immortal souls! Would not A. rather live with me, or die with me, than to survive or perish with his fellow-combatants, stained with the blood of guilty brothers, and authors of perdition to many a soul? But my advantages stop not there. If I succeed, the mob depart, with passions calmed and

restrained. Should mine be the first house, might not my course be the means, under God, of saving the city from the fury of the mob? If I fail, the mob depart with revenge satiated, but with no fierce excitement of ferocious feelings. Whether A. succeed or fail, it seems plain, from the exasperated passions of the populace, that nothing but a strong military force could control them; nor then, without desperate conflicts and much bloodshed. The state of the city under my success or failure, compared with his, I leave to the heart and imagination of A. himself, and all the advocates of defensive war. After reviewing the whole ground, will they not confess, with King Agrippa, 'Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian, on the principles of peace?'" *

These are instances or specimens of the popular objections, which are thrown out against the peace doctrine. Others might be easily given, if we had space for noticing every thing of this kind; and perhaps we might add with propriety, they might be as easily answered. Men may rely upon it, that a course of justice, tempered with unfeigned benevolence, will always be attended with the most favorable results. Is it not the *mercy* of God that leadeth to repentance? And if God's mercy, God's goodness, can thus influence and lead men to pursue a right course, why may not mercy and goodness in men have a similar effect? The fact is, the power of beneficence has never been fully estimated, and never been put fully to the test. When this is done, (and society will never rise upward to the mark of its destination until it is done,) it will be seen that we are not flighty and chimerical, nor even unphilosophical, in our views. Mental philosophers have told us of the power of the resentful passions; not only how they sometimes prompt to injury, but how they have power to restrain others from

* Calumet, Vol. II. p. 176.

doing injury. Political economists have told us of the power of bars, and gates, and prisons, in checking the tendencies to the perpetration of crime. But who, on philosophical principles, has investigated the power of beneficence and forgiveness? Beyond all question, it is the unalterable constitution of nature, that there is efficacy, divine, unspeakable efficacy, in love. The exhibition of kindness has the power to bring even the irrational animals into subjection. Show kindness to a dog, and he will remember it; he will be grateful; he will infallibly return love for love. Show kindness to a lion, and you can lead him by the mane; you can thrust your hand into his mouth; you can melt the untamed ferocity of his heart into an affection stronger than death. In all of God's vast, unbounded creation, there is not a living and sentient being, from the least to the highest, not one, not even the outcast and degraded serpent, that is insensible to acts of kindness. If love, such as our blessed Savior manifested, could be introduced into the world, and exert its appropriate dominion, it would restore a state of things far more cheering, far brighter, than the fabulous age of gold; it would annihilate every sting; it would pluck out every poisonous tooth; it would hush every discordant voice. Even the inanimate creation is not insensible to this divine influence. The bud, and flower, and fruit, put forth most abundantly and beautifully where the hand of kindness is extended for their culture. And if this blessed influence should extend itself over the earth, a moral garden of Eden would exist in every land; instead of the thorn and the brier, would spring up the fir-tree and the myrtle; the desert would blossom, and the solitary place be made glad.

CHAPTER FIFTEENTH.

ON EXERCISING THE OFFICE OF CHAPLAIN.

On the subject of exercising the office of military chaplain, we shall be very brief. If wars are wrong on gospel principles, then no man can exercise the office of chaplain in an army, or in any body of men assembled for military purposes, without a violation of those principles. — The first inquiry is, What is a chaplain commonly expected to do? If he were merely expected to communicate biblical instruction, and to labor for the personal salvation of the soldiers, with full liberty, both in public and private, to express his sentiments in relation to the unlawfulness and the evils of war, we are not prepared to say that the exercise of his office would necessarily be out of the pale of Christian duty. But this is not the expectation. A chaplain would not be tolerated in an army for a moment, who did not profess to be interested in the success of the war, however iniquitous it might be, and who would not pray for such success. He is a component part of the army, as much so as a surgeon, and is expected to identify his interests and feelings with theirs. Such is the close connection between the chaplain and the military enterprise to which he is attached, and to which he is called to minister, that undoubtedly instances might be adduced of preachers in this situation, who have publicly addressed soldiers on military as well as religious subjects, and have encouraged them with all the powers of their rhetoric in the prosecution of their sanguinary business. Now, when a person accepts the office of a chaplain, he accepts it on the implied condition, that he will dis-

charge its duties in accordance with the common practice and the common expectation. Any other supposition would be inadmissible, because it would universally be considered as implying dishonesty If these are correct views, then we maintain that no Christian minister can, consistently with the New Testament, and without sin, exercise the office in question.

First. He cannot preach as he ought to do. Now, it will unquestionably be conceded that a Christian minister is bound to declare the whole counsel and revelation of God; that he is not at liberty to mutilate and to keep back any thing which is important truth. It is true, he may exercise a prayerful and sound discretion in respect to the times and places when it may be proper for him to inculcate certain doctrines; but he is not at liberty to place himself in a situation where he cannot inculcate them at all. But this the military chaplain has done. There is a portion of the gospel which he has virtually pledged himself not to preach; there are some things which he cannot announce without giving great offence to his employers; he is silent, and, from his very situation, *must be so.* If he were to preach, in the presence of the soldiers, from some of the texts which have been introduced in the course of these discussions, such as "love your enemies," "dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves," "if your enemy hunger, feed him," "do good to them that hate you," he would assuredly cause great dissatisfaction. If he were to preach from them in the spirit of the gospel, giving them their full import, and pressing their practical application, it would be likely to be received as an insult.

Second. He cannot pray as he ought. If there is any occasion, on which his prayers are peculiarly needed, it is on the eve of a battle. The soldiers throng around him; and, with whatever carelessness

they may have listened on other occasions, they now eagerly attend to what falls from his lips. And how does he pray? What can he pray for? Beyond all question, he will find himself in such a situation that he cannot avoid praying distinctly and earnestly for the success of the army in which he is employed. And, if he prays for success and victory, (as we cannot suppose he expects they will be secured by a miracle,) he of course prays for a blessing on the means which are ordinarily employed at such times. In other words, he prays that the ball may be well directed and take effect, that the bayonet may strike surely and deep, that the sword and the lance may be plunged into the vitals of the enemy, that their houses may be burnt and destroyed, that their provisions may be cut off, that they may be sent by hundreds and thousands, in all the blood and agony of mortal conflict, into the pure presence of a holy God. Whether such a prayer (and it obviously means this or nothing) can be considered consistent with the benevolent principles of that gospel which requires us to do good to our enemies, to pray for them that despitefully use us, not to resist evil, and not to avenge ourselves, we leave to the reader to determine.

THIRD. His presence gives a countenance to all the evils which are attendant upon war; the profaneness, the intoxication, the Sabbath-breaking, the dissoluteness, that always gather in its train. These dreadful evils, as well as cruelty and bloodshed, are universally regarded as necessarily incidental to a state of war; no wars in times past have ever existed without them, nor have we any reason to expect it will be otherwise in future. It is not to be presumed, whatever may be the unfavorable tendencies of the human passions, that society would continue to tolerate the congregation of evils, direct and indirect, that are found in war, were it not for some fallacy in fact and reasoning. Men have been taught to believe

that wars are in some cases necessary, and that even the gospel justifies them; and the presence of the chaplain in an army, praying for its success, and throwing the ennobling sanctions of religion around the field of military preparation and battle, tends to encourage and strengthen this great error. Wars, they say, must sometimes be right, otherwise the minister of the gospel, who certainly ought to understand the principles of the religion he teaches, would not be in the midst of them, and would not sanction them by his presence. This is the effect upon men generally, upon the mass of the community. — Furthermore, we assert it with entire confidence, that, were it not for the countenance which they receive from professed Christians in the ranks of the army, and particularly from the chaplain, the soldiers themselves, hardened as they are by the tendencies of their occupation, would experience more misgivings, more doubt, more compunction of heart in their work of destruction and blood, than they are now generally found to do. They conclude, and very naturally too, if a preacher of the gospel, a commissioned minister of the Most High, with all his capabilities for forming a moral and religious judgment of things, approves their employment, and prays for its success, it would be an excess of scrupulosity in them to entertain a doubt. And the undoubted encouragement which they receive from this source, extends itself, in a greater or less degree, not only to the direct evils, but also to the indirect evils, of war. If the chaplain approves of war, it cannot be supposed, all things considered, that he has any very serious and fundamental objection to those incidental evils of Sabbath-breaking, profaneness, and the like, without which wars never have been, and never will be, carried on; especially if it should be the case, (as, under the existing circumstances, we imagine it will be likely to be so,) that he seldom takes an opportunity pointedly to preach

against and reprove them. — We are under the necessity, therefore, of coming to the conclusion, that ministers of the gospel cannot innocently and lawfully exercise the office of military chaplain. And if they should act generally in accordance with this view, we have no doubt it would tend greatly to check the spirit of war.

CHAPTER SIXTEENTH.

OF WAR IN CONNECTION WITH EDUCATION.

We have endeavored to show, in a former chapter, that the great work of restoring the world to permanent and universal peace, depends, in the first instance, mainly on Christians. All, who profess to be governed by the principles of the gospel, are called upon to act decidedly in their *Christian* character; in other words, to consider abstinence from war, in all cases, as an essential and indispensable requisite of that character. The world will never be permanently at peace until this doctrine takes effect. But, at the same time, we are not at liberty to neglect any rightful means whatever, which can be made subservient to this most desirable result. These means are various; but one of the most important is the gentle but efficacious influence of education. The application of this means of promoting peace may be stated in some particulars.

I. In the first place, something is to be done by heads of families, particularly MOTHERS. It is from them that the infant mind receives, in a great degree, not only its earliest, but its most decisive direction. And it is lamentably true, that the direction which they have been instrumental in giving has been too often in favor of a warlike spirit. They have probably not been aware of the unpropitious tendency of the course they have often pursued; but the evil has not, on that account, been the less real and great. They have planted the seeds, and promoted the incipient growth, of a military spirit, by permitting the childish exultation of their little ones, on witnessing

a military parade and review, to go unchecked. They have fostered this unholy spirit by allowing their children the soldierlike gratification of paper military caps, guns, feathers, swords, sashes, and all the miniature paraphernalia of war. They have put into their hands the accounts of Indian and border wars, the lives of military chieftains, military and patriotic ballads and songs, which come recommended to their youthful imaginations with the emblazonry of plates and cuts. These practices, for which mothers stand in a very high degree, if not exclusively, accountable, have been almost universal; their influence is felt by almost every man of the community; and it requires no small degree, both of philosophy and religion, to throw it off entirely, even in the soberness of manhood and old age.

"The two first books I ever read in private," says Robert Burns, "and which gave me more pleasure than any two books I ever read since, were the Life of Hannibal and the History of Sir William Wallace. Hannibal gave my young ideas such a turn, that I used to strut in raptures up and down after the recruiting drum and bagpipe, and wish myself tall enough to be a soldier; while the story of Wallace poured a Scottish prejudice into my veins, which will boil along there till the floodgates of life shut in eternal rest." The unfortunate Theobald Wolf Tone, speaking of his practice, in early life, of attending the military reviews of the garrison at Dublin, says expressly, "I place to the splendid appearance of the troops, and the pomp and parade of military show, the untamable desire, which I have ever since had, to become a soldier."

Let parents examine this matter, and, considering wherein they have been in error, pursue a different course, endeavoring to impress the susceptible minds of their children with the evils of bitterness and strife; checking all those childish practices which, adopted

under the impulse of the principle of imitation, breathe a military spirit, and substituting for the sanguinary narratives of human warfare the far more interesting records of kindness, of forgiveness, and of early piety.*

II. In the SECOND place, a decidedly beneficial influence in regard to this matter can be exerted by SABBATH SCHOOL TEACHERS. There are said to be, at the present time, not less than a hundred thousand instructors, and a million of Sabbath school pupils, in the United States. It is the duty of these instructors, not only to explain the doctrines which are made known in the Scriptures, but the duties which are there inculcated; to teach not only what they are to *believe*, but what they are to *do*. And if Sabbath school teachers will but fully inform them-

* "I lately visited," says Mr. Ladd, in one of his numerous peace publications, "a distinguished instructor of youth, who has recently been converted to the peace principles; and, being of a strong and discriminating mind, he did not stop half way, but came at once to the conclusion that *all* war is contrary to the spirit of the gospel, and has not been afraid to publish his opinion to the world. He told me that his boys were so taken up with military notions, that he could not reason with them; and he asked me to talk to them. I took the eldest boy, aged about seven years, between my knees, and something like the following conversation ensued: "Do you love to see the soldiers?" "O, yes; I love to see the rub-a-dubs." "Would you like to be one yourself?" "O, yes." "Well; but do you know what these soldiers are for?" "No." "Why, they are learning to kill people. Those bright guns are made to kill people with, and those bright bayonets to stab them with." The boy turned pale; such a thought never before entered his head. "Do you know who killed the little babes in Bethlehem, because a wicked man told them to?" "No." "They were soldiers. Do you know who crucified our Lord, and drove spikes through his hands and feet?" The boy was silent. "They were soldiers; and soldiers would burn your house, and cut down your fruit-trees, and kill your pa, if they were told to." Both the boys were astonished, as tears stood in their eyes. "Do you want to be a soldier?" "No." "Do you want to see the rub-a-dubs?" "No."

selves in relation to the doctrines and duties of peace, and will take the pains to impress them earnestly on the minds of their pupils, it is impossible to calculate how great would be the beneficial results. Let them, therefore, seriously consider the responsibility which is attached to them in this respect. They must become peace men themselves; they must imbibe the true spirit of the gospel in relation to contentions of every kind; otherwise, their instructions in respect to this subject will come with an uncertain and feeble aspect, and will do but little good. And while they endeavor to explain to their pupils that the gospel is a revelation of love, that it forbids a resort to arms and every species of unkindness, they will find occasion to remark on the practical results and evils of war, and the great guilt of men in permitting its existence. And thus their pupils will grow up in the spirit of peace, and will be likely, in all after-life, to diffuse around them the benign influence of pacific principles.

III. We may remark, in the THIRD place, that the instructions of the pulpit on the Sabbath constitute one of the methods of *education*. It is true, we do not, in fact, often speak of the pulpit and of preaching in this way; but it is not the less true that we have good reasons for doing so. It is beyond all question, that the influence of the pulpit on the intellect of the community, as well as on the heart, is exceedingly great. And certainly it cannot be denied or doubted, that the inculcation of the doctrines of peace comes within the legitimate sphere of the preacher's duties. Unless the ministers of the gospel of peace are willing to take the lead in the discussion and enforcement of this matter, how can it be expected that the heads of families, Sabbath school teachers, and other private members of their churches and societies, will either fully understand the subject or deeply feel its importance? Let it not be supposed

that we overrate the influence from this source. It cannot, I think, be doubted, that, on all moral and religious subjects, the most important school of education is the sanctuary: the rostrum of ancient eloquence, the professor's chair, the porticos of the Athenian philosophy, the lyceum, are thrown into the shade in comparison with this; and certainly no minister, who has imbibed, in its length and breadth, the spirit of the gospel, will exclude the doctrines of peace from the list of themes on which it is alike his duty and his privilege to expatiate.

Nor are they to be introduced incidentally, and after long intervals of time, as if they were of subordinate rank, and of little value. There may, indeed, be other themes, of more stirring interest, and of more vital import to individuals, — those which concern the prospects and probabilities of their own personal salvation; but it does not, by any means, follow from this, that the subject of peace is of small consequence, and can be safely buried in a corner, or hidden under a bushel. Very far from this. Every minister is sacredly bound to study this subject; to bestow upon it his prayerful and serious attention; to realize, and to impress upon his own mind, its importance; to methodize it, and array it in chosen forms of speech; and, with great earnestness, to urge it home upon the belief, and hearts, and consciences, and practice, of his hearers. With the blessing of God, he must *educate* them, not to the purposes of violence, hostility, and blood, but to the exercise of forbearance, kindness, meekness, forgiveness, and love; nor is he to circumscribe these benevolent exercises by the narrow domains of families and neighborhoods, but is to expand them, just as the blessed gospel does, to the limits of nations, to the circumference of the world. In other words, he must explicitly maintain, that the benevolent principles of the gospel — those which require love, forgiveness, the

endurance of evil, without rendering evil in return — are not more applicable to individuals than to communities, to families than to nations.

IV. Academies and colleges, also, have their duties to perform in relation to this matter. It is often remarked (and perhaps the remark is not wholly destitute of foundation) that the tendency of academical and collegiate education is to infuse into the young mind principles at variance with the humble and benevolent spirit of the gospel; in a single word, the tendency is to *heathenize* it. And, under the impression which this view of things is calculated to make, some estimable men (among others, the late Mr. Grimké, of South Carolina, whose labors in the cause of peace, and of benevolent efforts generally, we desire always to mention with respect and gratitude) have proposed some essential modifications in the course of instruction which has usually been pursued in such institutions. Among other things, they would entirely exclude the study of the Latin and Greek languages and literature. And why? Not because the classic languages — whether we consider their admirable structure, or their close and diversified relations to the English language, and to literature in general — are unworthy of attention; but because, being deeply imbued with a violent and warlike spirit, they can hardly fail to impart something of that spirit to the susceptible minds of youth. That this is an evil, we admit; nor do we deem it necessary to palliate the admission, by asserting that it is a small, an inconsiderable evil. But perhaps it ought to be remembered that it is an evil incidental to the literature of almost every nation, in modern as well as in ancient times. Is there more of violence, bloodshed, and crime, or less of moral principle, in Livy and Tacitus, than in Machiavel and Gibbon? We think not. A *Christian* history of war has never been written, and never will be, in the spirit of com-

mendation and eulogy. And yet all historians, modern as well as ancient, are eulogists; their works are sprinkled over with covert and open approvals and panegyrics of those who have secured great worldly objects by the worldly methods of violence and bloodshed. Nor is this evil limited to history. We meet with it in poetry, in statuary, in architecture, in painting; wherever we turn our eyes, we behold it; we cannot flee from it, but must confront it, oppose it, resist it. We do not, therefore, feel the propriety and importance of the proposition, that the ancient languages should be excluded from a course of public instruction, on the grounds which have been alluded to.

But, at the same time, it can undoubtedly be admitted, that some alterations and improvements can be made as to the manner in which these studies are to be pursued. What is chiefly necessary, in order to meet the objection to the study of the classic languages, which has been hinted at above, is, simply, that due care should be taken in the selection of books and portions of books. A selection certainly can be made, which, so far from tending to degrade the minds of youth, and to leave upon them impressions of an unfavorable kind, will have the opposite effect of infusing sentiments of justice, purity, and magnanimity. In many writers of antiquity, there are passages of a moral nature, which might well put to the blush those who have written in later times, and with better advantages for knowing the truth. If Professor Stuart should be able to complete his Select Classics, (the first volume of which, comprising Cicero's Treatise on the Immortality of the Soul, has already been published,) we shall have a work which surely cannot have a bad tendency.

But while, undoubtedly, such a course can be taken in this thing as shall be fully consistent with the interests of the great cause of peace and virtue, it must

be obvious that it is the duty of the higher institutions of learning to instil into youthful minds principles of moral duty more elevated and heavenly than can be drawn from the fountains of antiquity. The writers of antiquity had not those moral and religious advantages which we enjoy: if it had been their happy fortune to have possessed them, perhaps they would have improved them better. It is unreasonable to expect from them principles which are to be found in the gospel alone, and which came from the lips of Him who spake as never man spake. While, therefore, we would not insist that the higher institutions should lay aside the classics, but should only take such care in the selection of authors, and the parts of authors, as the interests of true virtue require, it is their bounden duty to make those who resort to them acquainted with the exalted philosophy, with the sublime and benevolent code, of the New Testament. While we do not feel at liberty to deny to their pupils the opportunity of imbibing instruction from the lips of Socrates, Cicero, and Seneca, and some other truly illustrious names, we would earnestly urge it upon them to give a prominent and emphatic utterance to the doctrines of Jesus Christ, and to baptize all other philosophy in his. All other systems of philosophy authorize the practice of war; but the teachings of the Savior, if we understand them either in the letter or the spirit, breathe a diviner note. They proclaim peace; they announce forgiveness; they return good for evil.

V. Finally, we take the liberty to make ân appeal to men of SCIENCE and LITERATURE. The power which these men possess, and which they exercise either for good or evil, is immense; it cannot easily be estimated too high. But it is with deep regret we are compelled to acknowledge, they have often prostituted their powers and their opportunities to purposes neither beneficial to society nor honorable to

themselves. There are multitudes of writers in the English language (and we know not that there are good grounds for claiming a greater purity for the literature of other nations) who give such false and degrading views of human nature, and inculcate such vicious principles, that it is not safe for youth or for any other persons to read them. There have been other writers, of a different stamp, who have combined the purest taste with the highest poetical invention, but who have struck their lyres in praise of that deceitful glory which is won on the field of battle, while they have not reserved a note for the pacific virtues of the gospel. How disastrous the influence of such writers has been, it would not be easy to describe.

But we indulge the hope of a better state of *things*; we already see its beginnings, — more refinement of taste, more purity of sentiment, more regard for the public morals and happiness, a gradual, but sure, approximation to the sublime purity and benevolence of the gospel standard. There is a new thing under the sun. Religious men, not nominally so, but in reality, — men of faith, benevolence, and prayer, — stand high, even by the consent of their opposers, in the ranks of literature; — men who, like Paul, can place themselves on the Areopagus, and hold disputation with philosophers, and, like the royal Psalmist, drink inspiration from Siloa's brook, "fast by the Oracle of God." How encouraging and delightful would it be, if all were such! if all powers of thought were baptized into the spirit of religion! if all powers of imagination were borne upward on the wings of the Celestial Dove! if all powers of perception, reasoning, and eloquence, were consecrated to truth, to purity, and the real happiness of man!

CHAPTER SEVENTEENTH.

NATIONAL GLORY AS CONNECTED WITH WAR.

ONE of the sources of evil and suffering, worthy of the notice of the Christian and philanthropist, is the false notions of glory which are so prevalent among mankind. That there is such a thing as reputation, however, or glory, or whatever other name it may be called by, it is not necessary for our present purpose to deny. If we may without impropriety speak of the glory of the Deity, may we not also speak of the glory of the creatures he has made, at least so far as they bear his likeness and reflect his excellences? It is true that the term GLORY is somewhat indefinite; and, if we should take time to define its meaning and its shades of meaning, we should be likely to occupy the whole space allotted to this chapter. Without, therefore, entering into this matter, we take it for granted that there is such a thing as glory,—as *true* glory,—and that every one, when he uses that term, attaches a meaning to it.

The phrase *national glory* suggests something rather more definite than the single term *glory*, used without any qualifying epithet. National glory, as the phrase is commonly understood at the present time, expresses that species of reputation or honor which is founded on brave and successful efforts in war. We do not mean to intimate that such is necessarily its basis, but merely to express the fact that such, at least, is its *imputed* basis. If there is any other foundation of national glory, it is scarcely recognized, and is certainly regarded as of little or no account. Such, therefore, is the perversity of the

human mind on this subject, that a nation's glory is estimated to be nearly in proportion to the national capabilities for destroying the human race in future, and the successful exercise of those capabilities in time past. When an Englishman speaks of the glory of his country, what is it he is thinking of? what particular recollections and associations occur to his mind? His mind is undoubtedly more taken up with the recollection of military achievements than with any thing else. He is musing, in all probability, on what his country has done nobly and successfully in war; on the splendid names of Blake, Howe, and Nelson, of Marlborough and Wellington, and others renowned in the history of his country, particularly in naval warfare, and is, perhaps, running over *in his* mind the spirited lyrics of Campbell, —

> "Ye mariners of England,
> Who guard our native seas,
> Whose flag has braved a thousand years
> The battle and the breeze."

And when a Frenchman speaks of the glory of France, what is *his* train of thought? and what are *his* reflections? Is his attention directed to the agriculture of the country, its commerce, its common schools, its social improvement, the progress of the useful arts, advancement in morals and religion? Whatever place these may have in his thoughts at other times, it is almost certain that, when his mind is inflated with the grand conception of national glory, they are never thought of. It is the pageant of warriors, battle-fields, and military monuments, that is sweeping before his excited memory; the battle of the Pyramids, the glorious death of Desaix, the wonderful passage of the Alps, worthy of the modern Hannibal and the sublime pencil of David, the terrible bridge of Lodi, the victory and the sun of Austerlitz.

National glory, therefore, in the common apprehension of the term, is to be regarded as the designation, or name, of a complex conception, embracing the various elements and capabilities of war, particularly as they have been exhibited in the past history of a country. And as such it is revolved, mused upon, and cherished, till it becomes a sort of personification, a species of animated existence, floating in the air, and radiant with celestial hues, and beckoning the beholders onward and upward to the transcendent heights. Now, what we mean to say is, that national glory, as thus understood, is a source of unspeakable evil; and that this false image, which is leading men astray, and hurrying them on to deeds of blood, ought to be demolished. As men never act without some motive, their actions, of course, take their character, in a greater or less degree, from the views which they may happen to form. Now, national glory, existing in this distorted and most injurious form, becomes, and is, a most powerful motive to action, stimulatin large masses of men with a sort of indescribable ry; so much so, that, although many wars have arisen from caprice, prejudice, and mere rapacity, a greater number have undoubtedly had their origin from erroneous conceptions of national glory.

But how are the evils which are now complained of to be corrected? In the first place, by showing that the glory which is based upon the elements, capabilities, and spirit of war, is no glory at all, but rather dishonor, disgrace, and ruin. And, although this is certainly a matter of some difficulty, yet it can probably be accomplished with suitable pains on the part of those who feel an interest in the subject of peace. Let Christians and philanthropists avail themselves of the agency of the press, and communicate extensively the statistics of the expenses of war, the increase of the people's burdens occasioned by war,

the immense loss of human life, the demoralizing effect of standing armies, the innumerable forms of domestic wretchedness originating from national strife, and the eyes of mankind will at last begin to open; they will arise as from a dream; the bright form of national glory, based upon war, will change its lustre, and look dark and lowering; and, under the impulse of better views, they will dash their idol to the ground, and trample it under their feet.

In the second place, efforts ought to be made to build national reputation or glory on a more correct foundation. And, in order to this, there must be, among other things, a great revolution in literature; a revolution which is already begun, and is perceptibly advancing. As matters now stand, music, painting, statuary, history, poetry, are all subservient to that false idea of national glory which is so prevalent. But a great change is destined to take place. As an instance and illustration of what has been remarked, we doubt not that the time will come, and probably soon come, when history will assume a new form, and be written upon new principles. It is now a mere series of battles. Very little is said of the organization of government, and of the principles on which governments are in *fact*, or *ought* to be, administered; still less of the progress of the arts and of knowledge in general, of the character and habits, of the virtues and the vices, of the sufferings and enjoyments, of the great body of the people. Military matters are predominant, and every thing else is thrown into the background. But the public mind begins to tire of these details of blood, and to demand another kind of food. The multiplication of such works as Hallam's Constitutional History of England, and Pitkin's Civil and Political History of the United States, (not to mention others, of a mixed historical and political character, such as La Croix's Review of the Constitutions of the principal States of Europe, President Adams's De-

fence of the Constitutions of the United States, and Judge Story's Commentaries on the American Constitution,) clearly indicates that the public taste is becoming less warlike, and more civic. So great is the change already taken place, that a debate in congress, convention, parliament, storthing, or cortes, on some great constitutional or political question, excites an interest throughout the nation, which, a few years since, could have been excited only by the announcement of thirty or forty thousand slain in some great battle. And now, let people generally begin to feel that their national glory, at least one great element of it, consists in the excellence of their civil and political institutions, rather than in their ability and skill in war, and the war spirit will soon be sensibly diminished, and the effects will be exceedingly beneficial.

A change is going on, also, somewhat analogous in its character, in other departments of literature. Even Poetry, that has been so long and so unhappily allied to the spirit of war, is beginning to put away the garments rolled in blood, and to array her native beauty in the pure and beautiful vestments of peace. A few years ago, and men's ears were so belligerent, that the charms of verse could hardly obtain a hearing, unless it breathed into them the trumpet-note of some bloody and horrible catastrophe. But now they begin to listen to a more soothing and peaceful strain; and the readers of the Cotter's Saturday Night — that delightful picture of a peaceful, domestic scene — outnumber, in all probability, those of Marmion and the Corsair. If the subject of Cowper's Task were some warlike enterprise, it probably would not secure one half the number of readers it now does, even if it were written with the same degree of poetical ability. But, although the signs of the times are decidedly favorable, in the matter under consideration, much, undoubtedly, remains to be done; the spirit of

war must be expunged, not only in part, but absolutely and altogether, from literature, and make way for the spirit of the gospel; so that it may exhibit that charmed aspect and expression of beneficence and purity which becomes it. And in this way, also, we may expect to see an invasion upon that false idea of national glory, which is so prevalent, and which is exerting such an unhappy influence. For, certainly, when historians shall bestow but a concise and cold narrative on military achievements, and other men of literature shall reserve their eulogies for the domestic and pacific virtues, the lustre which formerly spread so broadly and brightly over military deeds and daring, will rapidly grow dim, and a purer and better radiance begin to take its place.

In the third place, let the agricultural and mechanical arts, and all other arts of an innocent and useful character, receive more attention and honor. As matters now stand, — at least in many parts of the world, — the soldier is held in special esteem, and is the subject of marked notice and attention, while the mechanic and the husbandman are looked upon as belonging to a lower and less honorable class. Public feeling and sentiment, in this respect, should every where be set right. Some of the greatest and best of men have been cultivators of the soil. The remark of Washington, in one of his letters to Arthur Young, is worthy of being repeated and of being remembered. "The more I am acquainted with agricultural affairs, the better I am pleased with them, insomuch that I can no where find so great satisfaction as in those innocent and useful pursuits. In indulging these feelings, I am led to reflect, how much more delightful, to an undebauched mind, is the task of making improvements on the earth, than the VAIN GLORY which can be acquired from ravaging it, by the most uninterrupted career of conquest."

Finally, let the public sentiment be so directed and

improved, that men shall begin to realize the existence of national glory, in the truest and best sense of those expressions, in the diffusion of knowledge, in common schools, — in Sabbath schools, in the spread of correct moral sentiments, in the preaching of the gospel, in the training of souls for heaven. It is in elements like these that we find the basis of a true and abiding glory, which angels can behold with pleasure, and which God himself can approve. As the millennial day approaches, it is glory of this kind which is destined to arise and extend itself, and gather strength and brightness from age to age, while military and all other spurious forms of glory will sink and be blasted forever.

CHAPTER EIGHTEENTH.

OF THE DUTY OF PRIVATE CHRISTIANS AND MINISTERS.

Before leaving the subject of the means to be employed, in order to secure the triumph of pacific principles, it is proper to say something further of the duty which is especially incumbent on professors of religion. The subject has already, in repeated instances, been briefly alluded to; but it is obviously too important to be passed by without some further notice. The church of Christ must take the lead in this great work, or it is in vain to expect it will ever be done. It is believed that the experiment has already been so far tried, as to give satisfaction on this point. Again and again the miseries of war have been described; the vast expenses, and the system of taxation attendant upon a state of war, have been insisted on; appeals have been made, both to the sympathies and the interests of men; the subject has been frequently brought before men elevated in political life; but all in vain. It is true, public attention has been partially gained, and a slight impression has been made adverse to the practice of war; but the root of the evil has not been touched. The elements of the volcano are still at work under the surface of society, ready to burst forth, on a thousand imaginable conjunctures, with unmitigated fury.

But how does this happen? Why is it, that, after this repetition of warnings, and these repeated appeals, the danger is still imminent? It is because one great means, a means more effective than any other, has been wholly overlooked. Unhappily, with the exception of

the primitive Christians, and of a few more recent denominations of Christians, comparatively small in number, the appeal has never been made, from the time of Christ down to the present moment, to the Christian church *as a church*. It is true that appeals have frequently been made to professors of religion as men, as citizens, and as philanthropists; but very seldom, and never in the way of any general and systematic effort, have these appeals been made to them as occupying the distinctive and far higher ground of Christianity. They have never been taught to believe and to feel, as they ought to have been, that they cannot be accessory to war, and at the same time maintain their Christian profession; that war and Christianity are in utter and endless conflict with each other. Here is the key of the position; here is ground to be occupied, which has been almost wholly overlooked: if this ground shall once be secured, and a barrier, firm and impregnable, shall be erected here, this tremendous evil will soon cease to spread its devastations over the world.

Professing Christians occupy precisely the same position, in regard to the great pacific reformation which must, sooner or later, inevitably take place, that temperate drinkers but recently occupied in respect to the temperance reformation, which is now in such encouraging progress. It is but a few years since, and drunkards universally appealed for example and authority to those who were not drunkards, but nevertheless advocated the right and the expediency of drinking occasionally, only let it be done temperately. Nothing could be effected under such circumstances. It was found necessary that a new principle should be adopted, before a reformation could reach the drunkards; it was necessary that there should be an absolute and total reformation of the temperate drinkers. And now we have another great reformation in hand, still more important; and in pursuit of it we

declaim against military men and military statesmen; but we do not touch their conscience; we do not start them a hair's breadth from that position of crime and cruelty which we believe they occupy. And why not? It is because they are sustained by professors of religion; it is because, while they avowedly drink often and deeply into the spirit of war, the followers of the benevolent religion of Jesus support them by drinking *temperately;* it is because they see Christians cheerfully paying taxes for their support, and behold Christians in their own ranks, and hear Christians praying for their success. This is the secret, as time will assuredly show, of the great strength of that spirit of war which has so long pervaded the world.

If these suggestions are well founded, it cannot be denied that an immense responsibility rests upon the church; and we have no doubt that the time is coming, and coming speedily, when they will be disposed to confess, with sincere sorrow, that the immeasurable evils resulting from the wars in which men have been engaged, are justly chargeable, in a very high degree, to their own stupidity, blindness, and dereliction of principle. We solemnly put it, therefore, to the professors of the Christian religion, how they can answer it to their conscience and their God, that they remain so quietly and stupidly accessory to the evil of war, — by their own admission, one of the greatest evils that ever afflicted our sinful and suffering race. It will not avail them to say that they have always assented to the evils of war; that they have always maintained it would be for the interests of mankind to leave off war; the root of the malady is not reached by such methods as this; "*leviathan is not so tamed.*" In this case, as in others, and more than in most others, Christians are bound, by every consideration of duty and of love to Christ's cause, to oppose the spirit of the gospel to the spirit

of the world; to put off their shoes from their feet, and to stand firmly upon the only ground which will sustain them in such a conflict, — the holy ground of Christian *principle*. They must learn what the gospel teaches; the doctrine of the gospel, whatever it may be found to be, must be their immutable rule of conduct. When they conform themselves to this rule, and not otherwise, they may be said to act upon principle. And the rule of the gospel, the principle which it establishes beyond all question, is, total abstinence; touch not, taste not, handle not; have nothing to do with war; have nothing to do with the preparations for war. Wash your hands clean, now and forever, from the stain of human blood.

But in these views it seems proper to make a distinction between ministers of the gospel and the great mass of Christian professors. If a great responsibility rests upon professors of religion in general, a still greater rests upon preachers and ministers. All Christians are represented as lights in the world, and are required to let their light shine for the illumination of others; but ministers are, in some important sense, the light of private Christians. We are persuaded that no private Christian ought to mistake his duty on this subject; so explicit are the instructions of the New Testament in regard to it, that no one can justly plead ignorance; but this does not alter the well-known fact, that private Christians do not, as a general thing, adopt novel principles and practices, however scriptural they may be, unless they are led into them, and encouraged in the course they take by their stated religious teachers. We come to the conclusion, therefore, that the attention of ministers of the gospel is particularly called to the subject before us; that upon them, more than upon any other class of persons, rests the important question, whether wars shall cease from under the whole heaven. It is desirable that they should weigh well

this solemn responsibility. Whether they have done their duty in this matter hitherto, whether they have brought to its investigation all their powers of intellect, and all their spirit of prayer, is for them to determine. If they have not, let them think well of it; let them compensate, so far as can now be done, for the negligence of the past by the fervent zeal and untiring efforts of the future. If ministers will faithfully do their duty in this thing, there is no question that the churches will ultimately, and in all probability very soon, respond to their efforts. No minister ought to rest, no minister ought to consider himself as having discharged his whole duty, until he has seen the members of his church formed into a peace society on the gospel principle of *total abstinence*, renouncing forever, and at all hazards, military enrolments, military musters, the payment of military fines, and all other efforts and contributions of a clearly military nature. What a spectacle would then be presented to the world! Even impenitent and irreligious men would rejoice in it. Hope would arise in the darkened and depraved mind of the soldier. The eyes of experienced statesmen would be gladly directed to this transcendent beam of millennial light. Mankind would smile in their sorrows, and say, *It is indeed the star of Bethlehem!*

CHAPTER NINETEENTH.

OF NON-INTERCOURSE IN CONNECTION WITH PEACE.

If nations cannot, consistently with the principles of the gospel, go to war with each other, it becomes an important inquiry, what course they shall take in certain emergencies constantly occurring, such as the partial infraction of treaties, the confiscation or detention of property, the non-payment of debts acknowledged to be due, a refusal to reciprocate the privileges of commerce, and the like. In maintaining the inviolability of human life, and the utter unlawfulness of all kinds of war, it does not necessarily follow, nor do we intend by any means to assert, that we are bound to subject ourselves to the repetition of such injuries, if we can rightfully and peaceably avoid it. There is one practice already known in the law of nations, and sanctioned by high authority, which we apprehend will be more likely than more violent methods to secure the objects for which war is commonly commenced, and which, at the same time, possesses the immense advantage of being accordant with the principles of the gospel. We refer to the practice of non-intercourse. It will not surprise us if the mere soldier, or the man, who is so busy with his own private interests as to have no thought for the sufferings and tears of his fellow-men, should contract his lips with contempt at what he will deem, no doubt, a very pusillanimous suggestion. We do not hesitate, however, to assert that, when our efforts to secure with other nations an intercourse founded on justice and reciprocity have clearly failed, when we have nothing to expect but the reiteration of hostility and wrong,

the safest course we can take, if we consult our interest, and the *only* course, if we wish to be governed by the principles of the gospel, is to suspend that intercourse, and leave them to themselves. This is a practice to which we are not unfrequently obliged to resort in common life. If one of our neighbors is a man of a haughty and capricious temper, if his intractability be obviously such that he takes no cognizance of our good intentions, and is not disposed to reciprocate, or even to receive, our good offices,—having made all the kind advances which we reasonably can, we at length feel ourselves justified in taking the resolution of breaking off all communication. The person whom we thus discard is ready to engage in a quarrel; perhaps that is the object of his strange and refractory conduct; but we do not consider ourselves called upon by our character, either as men or as Christians, any longer to have any thing to do with him; least of all, in the way of bodily and personal conflict. We simply, both for our own sakes and for his, establish a system of NON-INTERCOURSE, and thus leave him to those opportunities of solitary reflection, which sometimes constitute the bitterest wages of iniquity. All moral, religious, and literary associations, formed by voluntary consent, act upon the same principle. If a member of such an association so far diverges from the line of its just and legal requisitions as to place himself in an injurious and hostile attitude, instead of taking the course of breaking his limbs and shedding his blood, they merely institute a non-intercourse, and insist, as a matter beneficial to all parties, upon his temporary or permanent removal. This is the case in churches, which are voluntary associations, formed for moral and religious purposes. When a member of a church pursues a course obviously at variance with the principles on which the church is constituted, the other members, after having used suitable means to reclaim him without effect re-

move him from their circle by suspending or excommunicating him. In other words, they establish a non-intercourse — a measure the most simple and effective, as well as being in accordance with the mild and benevolent spirit of the gospel.

The principle of non-intercourse is as applicable to nations as to individuals or to private associations; and happy and glorious will that day be, when it shall be substituted in the affairs of nations for a resort to war. It is not only a remedy which can be applied, but a remedy which will have effect; it will be more likely than any other to secure the object for which it is adopted. Let us illustrate the subject. We will suppose that France owes to the United States a certain sum of money, (say the sum recently in dispute,— five millions of dollars,) and refuses to pay. Then the question before the United States is, if all other means of redress have failed, whether, under these circumstances, they shall resort to the pacific measure of a suspension of intercourse, or to the belligerent measure of reprisals and war. Saying nothing of duty, saying nothing of the sacred requisitions of the gospel, we may with propriety compare the two measures on the ground of *expediency*. If we declare war, or make reprisals in any form, or take any truly belligerent measures, we may well inquire what we are likely to gain by such a course.

In the first place, do we gain the five millions? Not at all. If there had been no resort to warlike measures, the French might have ultimately paid the sum in question; but the resort to such measures at once puts the payment at an infinite remove. No one, who is acquainted with the character of the French nation, a people that have always plumed themselves on their warlike spirit, will be so foolish as to suppose (and the same may be said of almost every other nation) that they will pay the five millions, or the millionth part of five millions, on *com-*

pulsion. But is the loss of the five millions the *whole* loss? Certainly not. If the war is carried on with vigor, the expense will be at least fifty millions of dollars a year; and, supposing the war to continue five years, which is perhaps a fair estimate of its continuance, we incur the solid burden of two hundred and fifty millions. And if we add to this the loss incurred by the depredations on our commerce and in other ways, we may safely estimate the whole expense and loss to our nation at five hundred millions. And we lose in the conflict, at a reasonable estimate, fifty thousand men. This is the result; a loss of five hundred millions of money and fifty thousand men, and nothing gained; saying nothing of the demoralization attendant on a state of war, and of the unspeakable sufferings, scarcely ever exposed to the public eye, which are experienced in private families.

But, on the other hand, if we resort to the non-intercourse system, instead of war, we shall stand some chance of obtaining the original claim, because, while we take a course which does not render it dishonorable to the French to pay, we make it their interest to do so. And certainly, if the payment of five million of dollars is the original and actual ground of dispute, we are bound by every principle of interest, and of duty too, to take precisely that course, if it be a justifiable one, which will be most likely to secure the payment. And in other respects, how numerous are the advantages attendant upon this course! We incur no expense; we do not burden the people with excessive taxes; we lose no men; we do not suffer, in their countless ways of operation, the demoralizing influences of war. The merchants, of course, encounter some little inconvenience in altering the direction of their business, and introducing it into new channels; but this is so trifling as to be scarcely worth mentioning.

But, if these statements are correct, how does it

happen that nations have ever been so averse to adopting a suspension of intercourse, and have been so ready to plunge into war? It is owing, in a great degree, undoubtedly, to the prevalence of false and unchristian notions of *honor*. This is the secret of their strange conduct; and it is here we find the great difficulty which is in the way of correcting that conduct. The system of non-intercourse is regarded as cowardly and pusillanimous, while that of war is looked upon as courageous and noble, — a false notion, which enlightened policy and Christian feeling are beginning to correct. Mankind are beginning to open their eyes on this subject; they have long and deeply felt the immeasurable evils of war, and are, at last, convinced of the futility of warlike measures as a means of redress. And the time is coming, when the nation that shall substitute non-importation and non-intercourse measures for a resort to arms, instead of being accounted mean and pusillanimous, will encircle itself with a wreath of true glory, that shall grow brighter and brighter till the end of days.

But this is not all: as Christians, as men who profess to be governed by the principles of the gospel, we have no other resource. Acting on the principles of our great charter, which Jesus Christ has died to confirm, we are solemnly bound not to return evil for evil, not to give place to wrath, not to avenge ourselves; in a word, not to engage in war of any kind. The suspension of intercourse is the *extreme* remedy which is allowed us; and this is to be resorted to only in extreme cases. And it is an omen of good and glorious import, that distinguished politicians begin to occupy the position which the gospel here allows us. It is enough for our present purpose to mention Mr. Jefferson. The whole aspect of his administration was pacific. It is but justice to this distinguished man to allow, notwithstanding the asperity with which his character has sometimes been

treated, that he possessed an intellect of the most capacious grasp, and a heart endued with the kindly and benevolent sensibilities. He saw clearly the tremendous evils of tyranny, religious intolerance, church establishments, war, and slavery, and denounced them, not with an humble whisper and affected meekness, but openly and boldly. He distrusted power, particularly *military* power; because history had taught him that, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, it had been perverted and abused to purposes of oppression. And this, perhaps, accounts for some measures in his administration, which appeared singular enough to the advocates of the war policy. Abundance of ridicule was thrown on his gun-boat system, and his non-intercourse system,—on his ultra democracy, his experimental agriculture, and his philosophy; but it already begins to be whispered, that he both thought and acted with a foresight in advance of the age in which he lived. Undoubtedly he did. And Christians, who deeply lamented some peculiarities in his religious views, will not be slow, nor wanting in cordiality, in their commendation of his foresight, his independence, his regard for equal rights, his abhorrence of injustice, his broad and glowing views of the capabilities and advancement of mankind. And this is the man—saying nothing of others standing high in the ranks of politicians—who has given his seal, the ample and bright stamp of his expansive mind, to the doctrine of non-intercourse as a practical and effective principle in the regulation of the affairs of nations.

CHAPTER TWENTIETH.

PRACTICAL EFFICACY OF THE PRINCIPLES OF PEACE.

It may be said, with some degree of plausibility, that the principles of peace are not the principles of protection, and that, if we throw off the aspect and attitude of war, we shall not only be insecure against hostility, but shall invite it. Whether this objection involves a fallacy or not, it is beyond all question that it is cordially received as an undoubted truth by many persons, who invest themselves with it as with a shield, and avail themselves of its aid to throw back, to a measureless distance, whatever is addressed either to their understandings or their hearts, on the great subject of universal peace. They take their stand upon this simple proposition alone — that no nation is safe without military preparation. They assert, with as much confidence as if they were pleading the authority of a mathematical axiom, that there is no security, and no peace, except on the condition of bloodshed, — that he who will not fight must make up his mind to become the prey of every species of depredation. Nor can we justly assert it to be altogether without reason that men so generally take this position, when we remember that the history of the world, with but few exceptions, is the mournful history of international jealousy and strife. And yet we feel, in some degree, prepared to maintain (and we hope with the prospect of a successful issue upon the mind of the objector himself) that, amid all the belligerent elements existing either in individuals or communities, pacific principles are the surest safeguard. We verily believe that in these principles

there is a secret power, a hidden, but most effective energy, which is but imperfectly understood. If men had the faith to receive it, they would not fail to find that the panoply of love is more impenetrable to the attacks of adversaries than that of steel.

We hope not to be charged with extravagance. God himself has made provision for this great result. The security which is to be found in pacific principles, is based in the constitution of the human mind itself. We are so constituted by our Maker, that we naturally feel an interest in innocence and weakness; and it excites in every man, whose feelings have not been greatly perverted, the deepest disapprobation and abhorrence, when they are made to suffer. Why is it that little children, and women, and feeble old men, are, in a vast majority of cases, fully protected amid the wide-spread and deepest horrors of war? Will it be said that they find their protection in force? But they exhibit nothing of this kind; they have no arms; they present no organization and array of battle: on the contrary, they make their appeal to the PENETRALIA of the soul; they look for protection to the great principles of humanity alone. A little child was once found on the field of battle by an infuriated soldier of a victorious army. He looked up into his face, and, prompted by the protecting instincts of nature, exclaimed, "*Do not kill me, I am so little.*" In such a simple appeal as this, coming from the soul, and addressing itself to the original and immutable principles of our nature, we do not hesitate to say, that there is a reality and effectiveness of power. Perhaps there are men to be found who would kill the little child in the very act of making this simple and pathetic appeal. But do not the most sacred instincts of our nature rise up against them? Do we not call them base assassins, murderers, and monsters? Is there one to be found in a million who would be accessory to such a crime? It is with the

greatest confidence, therefore, we assert that, in the elements and arrangements of things, a wise and adequate provision is made for the protection of innocence and weakness. It is in consequence of this provision, which a kind Providence has made, that the tempest of war, while it smites the strong man armed, while it rends the oak and the mountain rock, so often leaves uninjured the reed and the flower, that bend submissively before it.

We might bring instances, multitudes of instances, from common life, where mild and pacific measures have secured that protection which never would have been yielded to force. There is much philosophy in one of Æsop's fables. The sun and the north wind once had a contest which should first disarm a certain traveller of his cloak. The wind blew, but the traveller wrapped his cloak about him; it blew more loudly and angrily, but the traveller, exerting all his strength, held his cloak more firmly and closely than ever. The sun took an opposite course; he gave no indications of violence and wrath; he spread over hill and valley the warmth of his purest and gentlest radiance; the traveller smiled, and at once yielded the cloak to kindness, which he had refused to force. This is a picture of human life. It finds its counterpart all the world over; and it would be an endless labor to exhaust the illustrations and proofs which every where present themselves.

In the early part of the year 1833, or about that time, an agent of the Bible Society was travelling in the Mexican province of Texas. His course lay through a piece of woods, where two men waylaid him with murderous intentions, one being armed with a gun, the other with a large club. As he approached the place of their concealment, they rushed towards him; but finding that no resistance was offered, they neither struck nor fired. He began to reason with them; and presently they seemed less

eager to destroy him in haste. After a short time, he prevailed on them to sit down with him upon a log, and talk the matter over deliberately; and finally he persuaded them to kneel with him in prayer; after which they parted with him in a friendly manner.* — And this is the direct tendency of a pacific and benevolent course; it touches a chord in every human heart; it has influence with the most abandoned; it has power even with the assassin.

Nor is this meant as a mere emphatic declaration, which is to be taken with some diminution of its obvious import. We have no doubt that a traveller would be more safe among an uncivilized and barbarous people, where assaults and assassinations are frequent, without arms than with them, provided it were *known* that he was unarmed. And, in proof of the correctness of this opinion, we will introduce here an extract from Ramond's Travels in the Pyrenees. Speaking of the Spanish smugglers, he says, "These smugglers are as adroit as they are determined, are familiarized at all times with peril, and march in the very face of death; their first movement is a never-failing shot, and certainly would be a subject of dread to most travellers; for where are they to be dreaded more than in deserts, where crime has nothing to witness it, and the feeble no assistance? As for myself, alone and unarmed, I have met them without anxiety, and have accompanied them without fear. We have little to apprehend from men whom we inspire with no distrust nor envy, and every thing to expect in those from whom we claim only what is due from man to man. The laws of nature still exist for those who have long shaken off the laws of civil government. At war with society, they are sometimes at peace with their fellows. The assassin has been my guide in the defiles of the boundaries of Italy; the smuggler of the Pyrenees has received me

* Calumet, Vol. I. p. 581.

with a welcome in his secret paths. Armed, I should have been the enemy of both; unarmed, they have alike respected me. In such expectation, I have long since laid aside all menacing apparatus whatever. Arms may, indeed, be employed against the wild beast; but no one should forget that they are no defence against the traitor; that they irritate the wicked, and intimidate the simple; lastly, that the man of peace, among mankind, has a much more sacred defence — his character." *

I have often thought that the history of missionary efforts throws some light upon the great, but hitherto generally unacknowledged, truth of the protective efficacy of pacific principles. The missionary goes from his native country into some distant and savage land; he takes up his abode in desert and inhospitable places, among a people of a strange language and ferocious habits; he teaches a new and holy doctrine, altogether at strife with the superstitions and practices of their country; he has no military arms for his defence, but is in that respect utterly exposed and defenceless. And yet he is entirely secure; far more so than if he were girt round with the unholy protection of weapons of war. With a mild and beneficent expression of countenance, he is greeted by rude and ferocious savages, whose trade has been one, through life, of hostility and bloodshed. They see that he is a man of peace; they recognize the exalted and divine nature of the principles of peace; they are struck with veneration and with awe; something within them (the voice of that God whom they have been accustomed to see in the sun, and the stars, and the woods, and the mountains) persuasively whispers that the man of love and peace is under the special protection of the Great Spirit, and that it would be wrong, as well as dangerous, to do him harm. We would not, however, be under-

* As quoted in Hancock's Principles of Peace.

stood to deny that missionaries have sometimes been persecuted, and have sometimes fallen on the trying field of their labors; but, so far as we have been able to learn, it has always happened under misapprehensions, on the part of the savages, of their true character, intention, and objects. Whenever their character and objects have been fully apprehended, they have stood erect and safe; they have gone forth amid the perils that surrounded them, like the pious men of old, who were unharmed in the midst of the fiery furnace; the mouth of lions has been shut, and the Eliots, Brainerds, and Martyns, have walked fearlessly and securely in their den; not because a miracle has been wrought in their favor, but because the God of nature and of revelation has, by an immutable purpose, linked the lion and the lamb together; has attached power to peace, has imparted efficacy to love.

And we might with propriety refer here to those sects of Christians who have adopted the peace doctrine as one of their distinctive tenets; particularly to the Quakers, or Friends. This religious sect is understood to reject altogether the use of military arms as a means and resource of defence. Acting upon that leading doctrine of the Savior, that we should love and do good even to our enemies, they call to their aid the protection of no weapons but those of justice and affectionate goodwill. But who ever hears of a Quaker being insulted, beaten, dragged out of his house, or in any way maltreated and injured?

> "Integer vitæ scelerisque purus,
> Non eget Mauri jaculis neque arcu."

Even in times of war, when hostile armies are spreading their devastations over the country, their dwellings are safe, their persons are respected; while, in mournful contrast, those who look for protection in

the practical application of the pugnacious and military doctrines, are seen wrapped in fire and weltering in blood. We do not mean to say that in no case whatever has a member of those religious sects, who adopt, in their full extent, the principles of peace, been doomed to suffer violence and injustice; but we do mean to say (and to assert it, too, with entire confidence) that, as a general thing, they have found in the celestial shield of their amicable principles far more of quietude, far more of protection and happiness, than other religious sects have who have recognized the right of an appeal to force.

History is rich in proofs on this subject. During the first century and a quarter after the settlement of New England, the inhabitants were constantly, with the exception of some short intervals, exposed to attacks from the savage tribes. But the Quakers, who were mingled with the other inhabitants in various places, were entirely safe, although they refused to avail themselves of the protection both of arms and of garrison houses. The Indians said, "They had no quarrel with the Quakers, for they were a quiet, peaceable people, and hurt nobody, and that therefore none should hurt them." * During the rebellion in Ireland in the year 1798, (also in the same country during the revolution of 1688,) the Friends, by keeping true to their peaceable principles, were preserved from the miseries of those disastrous periods. Of the occurrences in 1798, so far as the society of Friends was concerned, we have an interesting and circumstantial account in Thomas Hancock's Principles of Peace — a work exceedingly worthy of the attention of the friends of pacific doctrines. Amid the greatest excitement of the public mind, when crimes were frequent, and every species of violence was practised,

* Chalkley's Travels, as quoted by Hancock on Peace. Chap. VI.

the Society of Friends, although in immediate contact with both of the hostile parties, lost but *one young man*. And this person, subjecting his principles to his fears, had taken the course of wearing a military uniform, and of associating with armed men; and this was the occasion of his death.

The statements which have been made in respect to the Society of Friends, are corroborated by the history of other pacific sects—the Shakers, Menonists, Dunkers, and Moravians. During the rebellion in Ireland in 1793, the rebels, it is stated, had long meditated an attack on the Moravian settlement at Grace Hill, Wexford county. At length, in fulfilment of their threats, a large body of them marched to the town. But the Moravians, true to their principles in this trying emergency, did not meet them in arms, but, assembling in their place of worship, besought Jehovah to be their shield and protector in the hour of danger. The hostile bands, who had expected an armed resistance, were struck with astonishment at a sight so unexpected and impressive; they heard the prayers and praises of the Moravians; they listened to supplications in their own behalf; and, after lingering in the streets a whole day and night, they with one consent turned and marched away, without having injured an individual.*

The Shakers, too, have experienced a share of that protection which pacific principles are sure to afford. About the year 1812, the inhabitants of Indiana were harassed by incursions from the Indians; but the Shakers who lived in that region, although they were without garrisons and without arms, appear to have been entirely secure, while the work of destruction was going on around them. The question was once put to a prominent chief, why the Indians did not attack and injure the Shakers as well as others. His

* The Friend of Peace, Vol. II, No. 7.

answer was, "We warriors meddle with a peaceable people! That people, we know, will not fight. It would be a disgrace to our nation to hurt such a people." *

If we turn away from individuals, and from classes of men, we shall find in states and nations a development, and demonstration even, of the vast moral power of pacific principles. There is within the limits of Italy a little commonwealth, called the republic of San Marino. This is said to be, and probably is, the smallest independent state in Europe, occupying, in its whole circuit, a single mountain and two adjoining hills. Its whole extent is bout thirty square miles; and it comprises, in its capital and four villages, 7000 inhabitants. The government is in the hands of a senate of three hundred elders, and an executive council of twenty patricians, twenty burghers, and twenty peasants. This inconsiderable republic has existed, nearly the same as at present, for thirteen hundred years. Within that long period, mighty nations have arisen and fallen; Italy itself has been again and again visited with mighty armies, and covered with blood; crowns have been rent, and dynasties have crumbled; republics, too, proud in their military strength, and unwisely disposed to nourish a military spirit, have been swept away from the face of the earth; while the little republic of San Marino, which, relatively considered, has ever been utterly defenceless, has remained unassaulted and safe. Its weakness, and its professedly acting upon pacific principles, has been the secret of its strength, and not the smallness of its territory. No one, intimately acquainted with history, can have failed to perceive that no territory is so small or so barren, as not to be an object of national cupidity. And San Marino would long since have been incorporated into

* The Friend of Peace, Vol. II. No. 3.

the domains of some neighboring and more powerful state, had it not been for the irreparable disgrace which would have attached to such a transaction.

Another instance, illustrative of the views which we are now taking, is the Loochoo Islands, situated in the neighborhood of the Chinese Sea. The people of these islands are asserted, by those who have visited them, to be ignorant of arms, and of the art and practice of war. As might be expected under such circumstances, they are found to be a people singularly agreeable in their tempers and manners, distinguished for their honesty and integrity, well acquainted with agriculture, and also with some of the mechanical and manufacturing arts. It does not appear that their ignorance of war, and their reliance on pacific principles, render them more insecure than other nations; their benevolent and pacific character is the pledge of their security; they live in peace among themselves and with others, and are happy.

The mention of this singular people naturally reminds us of their neighbors, the Chinese. It is well understood that the Chinese are almost entirely destitute of military resources and power; nor do they appear to have any military aptitudes and dispositions. But what nation stands more secure? What nation has experienced fewer violations of its territory, or fewer infractions of its rights? It is with them as it was with the Romans in the time of Numa Pompilius. Before the time of that king, Rome was at war with all the neighboring nations; a great portion of Italy was constantly in arms; and no name was more dreaded and hated than that of the Romans. Numa took a different course from that of his predecessor, the warlike Romulus; he introduced religious rites and ceremonies; he endeavored to turn the attention of his people from warlike pursuits, and to inspire them with a love for the practices and arts of peace;

he quelled the dissensions existing among themselves, and inculcated upon them a reverence for the Deity. The neighboring nations, who anticipated from the Romans an interminable war, were filled with astonishment at such an unexpected change. They threw aside their arms, and hailed the Romans as friends. The statement of Livy is, "Finitimi populi, qui ante, castra, non urbem, positam in medio ad solicitandam omnium pacem, crediderant, in eam verecundiam adducti sunt, in civitatem, in cultum versam Deorum, *violari ducerent nefas!*"

The republic of Switzerland is another instance favorable to the illustration of our subject. Since the early efforts of that remarkable people to throw off the yoke of Austria, and to establish themselves as an independent state, (that is to say, for the long period of 500 years,) they have, with but few exceptions, been at peace with the surrounding nations. While other nations around them — France, the states of Italy, Austria, Prussia, Saxony, and Holland — have been engaged in an endless series of bloody wars, the Swiss have remained quiet upon their mountains, have tilled, with patience and cheerfulness, their rugged soil, and have reaped the rewards of their laborious industry and pacific principles, in the possession of health, competence, honor, and domestic enjoyments. Will it be said that the security which Switzerland has enjoyed has been owing to the acknowledged fact of the distinguished bravery of her sons? That this has had its weight cannot be doubted; but this circumstance alone does not furnish an adequate explanation. The form of the Swiss government is that of a confederated republic; the cantons are dissimilar in religion and habits; and the bond of the confederacy, while it secures the great object of union, is too feeble to secure that of strength. Independently of the acknowledged bravery of her inhabitants, and of the facilities for defence

furnished by her Alpine position, Switzerland is undoubtedly one of the weakest countries in the world. Her citizens are brave, undoubtedly; but what does that avail, if there is not strength enough in the general government to concentrate them in sufficient numbers, and for a sufficient length of time, in those strong-holds, which nature has built up in the midst of her? Beyond all question, it is in the power of some of the neighboring states to overrun and conquer Switzerland, if they had the disposition so to do; and yet she remains undisturbed, free, flourishing, happy. And the simple reason is, not that she has any thing like the military strength of England, France, or many other nations, but because she exhibits no undue ambition to enlarge her territory, aims at no other object than security within her own limits, is scrupulously upright and honorable in her treaties and political conventions; in a word, endeavors to give no just and well-grounded offence to any one. Such a nation will always be found to be essentially impregnable, because it will have in its favor the moral sense of the great community of civilized nations.

Another instance in favor of our views is to be found in the history of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Of the character of the distinguished founder of Pennsylvania, by whose advice its early doings were chiefly directed, and who stamped upon its early history the impress of his own great mind, it is unnecessary to speak any further than to say, that, by its simplicity, benevolence, and strict uprightness, it was the pattern of what every statesman, who wishes well to his country, ought to exhibit. He had no ends of violence to accomplish; and whatever he did was done in the spirit of justice. And what was the result? Was his colony the scene of strife and bloodshed? So far from it, that, for seventy years after the forming of his celebrated treaty with the Indians, (that treaty of which Voltaire said, with too much

truth, "that it was the only one ever concluded between savages and Christians, that was not ratified with an oath, and the only one that was never broken,") not a single note of warlike preparation was heard. While the Puritans of New England, with all their estimable qualities, were involved in frequent and bloody wars with the savage tribes, the colony of Penn remained at peace; the Indians around them, mistrustful through ignorance, and violent by habit, recognized, with an instinctive quickness, the preëminence and sacredness of benevolent principles, held forth the wampum of pacification, and smoked with their Quaker brethren the calumet of love. It was not the sword that tamed their unconquerable spirit; it was not the threatening aspect of military array; but the simple principle of non-resistance — a principle so unheard of, so out of the common track, so sublime, so godlike, that they bowed down before it as one man.

And might we not further appeal to the history of our own beloved country, acting in its confederated and national capacity? The policy of the United States, since the acknowledgment of our independence by England, has been essentially, and in a very marked degree, *pacific*. It must be very obvious to any one who has studied the history of our country, that our rulers have based their expectations of success in their external policy, not so much upon our military power, as upon the just and equitable principles which they have endeavored to infuse into that policy. Our national expenditures for military and naval purposes, compared with those of other nations of the same amount of population, are exceedingly small. And yet the United States have ever received, in their intercourse with foreign nations, their full share of respect and confidence; they have indeed, sometimes, owing chiefly to the peculiarly disturbed state of Europe, suffered great and unmerited inju-

ries; but they have seldom failed, in the end, of obtaining ample redress. We certainly hazard nothing in saying, that they would not be more respected, happy, successful, or better treated, if their policy were of a more martial and belligerent cast.

In conclusion, let us not forget, that the Supreme Being always regards those with a peculiar interest, who, in the exercise of a sincere and humble reliance upon him, endeavor to do his will. Human nature is undoubtedly so constituted, that a truly and consistently pacific life is the best protection, so far as human agency is concerned, which one can possibly have. But, in addition to this, the eye of that God, without whose notice not even a sparrow falls to the ground, watches and guards those who trust in him. "It is better to trust in the Lord, than to put confidence in princes." "When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." These are his own declarations. Let us take him at his word, and not incur the woe denounced upon those who went down to Egypt, and trusted in chariots and horsemen, but looked not unto the Holy One of Israel. Let us rather imitate the example of the pious Ezra, when placed in a very trying situation: "And I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way; because we had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them that seek him, but his power and his wrath is against all them that forsake him. So we fasted and besought our God for this, and he was entreated of us."

THE END.

3 2044 038 487 112